This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

366.7
Driver
cop. 2

יהוה

Clarendon Press Series

HEBREW TENSES

DRIVER

London

MACMILLAN AND CO.

PUBLISHERS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF

Oxford

Clarendon Press Series

A TREATISE

ON

THE USE OF THE TENSES

IN

HEBREW

BY

S. R. DRIVER, M.A.

Fellow of New College

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

M DCCC LXXIV

[*All rights reserved*]

23,345

PREFACE.

THE present small volume is designed as an attempt to supply what has for long appeared to me to be needed in England by the student of Hebrew—an exposition upon an adequate scale, and commensurate with the importance of the subject, of the nature and use of the Hebrew tenses. Upon most of the points connected with Hebrew grammar, the student can from more sources than one—I need but instance the lucid and admirable work of Dr. Kalisch—acquire a minute and accurate acquaintance with the language: but in their treatment of the verb, and especially of its two leading forms, they all from one cause or another seem suddenly to withdraw their assistance and fail. The merely empirical treatment is inadequate and unsatisfying; and that which essays to be something more is obscure, abstract, and hard. Yet it is just here that the novel and peculiar difficulties which the Semitic languages offer for the embarrassment of the learner reach their culminating point: but so disproportionately small is the space allotted to the subject, and so slight is the prominence given either to the difficulties themselves or to the solutions which they demand,

that the reader is only too apt to hasten on, and apply himself to what apparently has more urgent claims upon his attention.

Such a course as this is likely, however, to prove unsatisfactory and disappointing. The strength of an ancient language lies in its verb. No one can read a Greek author with profit who has not firmly grasped the distinction between the aorist and the imperfect: till he has done this, he will misappreciate his poetry, misconconceive his history, misunderstand his philosophy. In the same way, without a vivid sense of the difference between the perfect and the imperfect in Hebrew, it is no exaggeration to say that the force and beauty of the language, its pointed and rich expressiveness, are seriously blurred and lost to sight. Like the trained hand of the painter, which by a touch can turn a tear into a smile, the verb in all these languages is a flexible and elastic instrument which by the smallest movement effects a total change in the scene it is employed to describe: alter but a single letter, for דבר read ידבר, for ἀγόρευσεν, ἀγόρευεν, and the picture is suddenly transformed, becoming instinct with animation and life. When the prophet (Joel i. 19 f.) wishes to make the first intimation of the presence of life upon the scene of blank and motionless desolation, he characteristically introduces the new tense which before he had scrupulously avoided. To the outward eye the change is slight, and might easily be deemed insignificant: but this single instance will shew how imperfect and inadequate must be the impressions left upon those—if any there be—for whom such variations lie unnoticed.

It is not, however, an easy task for the student to realise and appreciate the distinctions presented by a new lan-

guage. Many indeed, it may be feared, though devoting long years to the study, never succeed in quite seizing and applying the distinction just alluded to between ἀγόρευσεν and ἀγόρευεν. The reason is obvious. We are spell-bound by language—by our own language in particular. Through a thousand subtle agencies which defy analysis, the language we have spoken since the time when we were children has moulded our ideas, swayed our reasonings, carved out channels for our thoughts: it permeates our being, and we are practically as powerless to elude its influence as we are to escape from the atmosphere in which we live immersed. That which is the common property of all languages we can indeed never shake off: that which is peculiar to our own, only by forcible and protracted efforts. For each language has its own lights and shades, draws its own lines of demarcation, carves its own channels, the existence of which, if not fatal, is at least unfavourable, to the recognition or employment of any others. On the agreement of a verb with its subject in number, a point to which in many easily-intelligible cases the ancient Hebrew attached no importance whatever, we are ourselves peculiarly sensitive and precise: on the distinction of tense, which in Hebrew is fundamental, English, except in the more obvious cases, is comparatively indifferent. Singularly enough, though it is deeply engraven upon German, and though it is impossible to open a single page of a classical author without observing it, the great and profound distinction between *being* and *becoming*, between *seyn* and *werden*, εἰμὶ and γίγνομαι, between the forms descriptive of an achieved result and those which characterise the process by which it is attained, has

never been fully appropriated or naturalised in English. Thus 'I am convinced' has unfortunately to do duty for πείθομαι as well as for πέπεισμαι, for 'ich *werde* überzeugt' as well as for 'ich *bin* überzeugt;' ἔπειθον differs indeed essentially from ἔπεισα, yet so cumbrous is the mechanism which has to be set in motion in order to do it justice, so palpable is the strain to which, especially if repetition be required, our language is subjected in the process, that we feel irresistibly tempted to discard and forget the distinction. Nor is it solely from a philological point of view that such inabilities are a loss, though this may be the only aspect which interests us here. Of course we are able to say 'I get convinced' no less than 'I am convinced,' 'I was advising' no less than 'I advised:' but we are not accustomed to think of the two expressions as contrasted or alternative formulae, and for more reasons than one they do not practically come into competition with each other. Hence the contrast being unnoticed, the distinction involving no important consequences, we are apt not to assign to it its due prominence even in a language where it is being constantly applied and where, upon its being rightly observed, the force and propriety of a sentence may entirely depend.

These remarks bear, if possible, more directly and pointedly upon Hebrew than even upon the classical languages. Hebrew has but two tenses at its disposal: each of these, therefore, has to cover the ground occupied in an Aryan language by half-a-dozen or more distinct formations, each representing a different relation of time or mood. It might at first be thought that with an instrument of such limited resources insuperable ambiguities would arise: but so consummate is the skill with which it

is handled that to the reader who strenuously resists the temptation, strong though at times it may be, but irretrievably fatal if yielded to, of considering a sentence by itself without reference to the connection in which it has been embedded by its author—*in verbis etiam tenuis cautusque serendis*—the ceaseless variation of tense, instead of being a cause of confusion, will seem one of the most telling and expressive features in the language. Often indeed the sense is so delicately balanced that it may be truly said to 'stand upon a razor's edge,' and a false estimate of a single point may disturb and dislocate the whole. Nor will our final estimate coincide always with our first. Still, in general, the limitations imposed by the context are such that while precluding serious ambiguity they allow ample scope for those rapid transitions, the capacity for which forms an element of force almost peculiar to Hebrew, and one in which it displays a decided superiority over the languages of Greece and Rome. But unless the two tenses, and particularly the imperfect, were as flexible as they actually are, this element of force would evidently be wanting: their own inherent elasticity, far surpassing that of any tense in the Teutonic or classical languages, but regulated and kept ever in check by surrounding conditions, is the source from which their unique expressiveness immediately springs.

There are, however, many obstacles to be overcome before the true nature of the tenses can be even approximately realised. Each tense, and particularly the imperfect, seems to unite in itself the most incompatible meanings, which the reader finds resist all his efforts to reconcile with one another, or to derive from a common origin; and the bewildering complica-

tions, superadded when either of them is attached to the Proteus-like *waw*, defy apparently every attempt to reduce them to order. And yet it is impossible, so long as language is the reflex and embodiment of reason, that anomalies such as these can be ultimate and inexplicable: some hidden link of connection must exist, some higher principle must be sought for, the discovery of which will place us at the true centre of vision, and permit the confused and incoherent figures to fall into their proper perspective, and so to become consistent and clear. The difficulties arising from the phenomena alluded to I have felt forcibly myself, and also the hopelessness of being able to surmount them without further assistance than is usually accessible to the student. I have also had a daily-increasing sense of the supreme need and value, if it is our desire to do justice to the idea and intention of the writer, of estimating the exact effect of every tense which he employs; and should this volume, whether by solving any seeming inconsistencies, or by directing attention to what might otherwise have passed unobserved, contribute at all towards a fuller and more accurate appreciation of the language of the Old Testament, its purpose will have been amply secured.

It remains that I should characterise the position which I occupy as regards previous writers. First and foremost among these must, of course, be named the brilliant and distinguished scholar who may be truly called the father of rational Hebrew grammar. It is indeed unfair, in speaking of the progress of Hebrew learning in modern times, to omit the name of Gesenius: Gesenius did much for Hebrew grammar, and more for Hebrew lexicography; but to the originality and penetration of Ewald

is to be ascribed the foundation of a new era in the study of the language. Arbitrary at times and impetuous—when is genius not so?—Ewald is one of those thinkers who seem to move in a different plane from ordinary men: possessing in a rare degree the power of seizing the right clue for unravelling a tangled web, and of recognising the true principle which underlies and is presupposed by an isolated fact, he applies to whatever he touches a fresh and unconventional mode of treatment, is never at a loss for a fruitful and suggestive combination, and can always bring to bear upon his subject luminous and appropriate conceptions. Upon all modern views, however divergent, of the history, literature, and language of the Old Testament, Ewald has left an indelible impress, an impress which is not the less real because it may be disguised or disowned. In truth, directly or indirectly, every Hebrew scholar in Christian Europe owes his training to Ewald: even those who have advanced the furthest beyond their master, whether by criticizing or combating the opinions which they have deemed mistaken, or by developing and elucidating what he left incomplete or obscure, have been enabled to do this solely in virtue of the position in which he has placed them. To the student who moves uneasily within the confining limits of the ordinary grammars, the *Lehrbuch* is the opening of a new world; however carefully and conscientiously collected, the materials offered by the former are but dry bones; but in Ewald's hands they seem suddenly to group themselves into living forms, and we begin to catch a glimpse of the inward and animating power which before was hidden from our eyes. Nevertheless, the *Lehrbuch*, unless it met with an exceptionally skilful translator, would probably be disappointing

in an English form: as it stands, it appeals to German readers, not to English ones; to our ears, its nomenclature would be strange and unfamiliar, its massive and involved sentences repellent and obscure. Nor is the arrangement of the work as perfect as it might be, and points are not unfrequently left without the explanation which their difficulty and importance really demands.

The gigantic *Lehrbuch* of Friedrich Böttcher, the accidence alone of which—its author did not live to complete the syntax—comprises no less than 1200 large and closely-printed octavo pages, overcrowded as it is, is nevertheless a monument of industry, and invaluable as an exhaustive collection of fact and forms. It is, in fact, a grammatical concordance to the Old Testament, which deserves to be more widely known and used in England, at least as a work of reference, than seems to be the case.

In addition to these two works, I have also consulted the Essay on the Imperfect in Dietrich's *Abhandlungen zur Hebr. Grammatik* (Leipzig 1846): though I feel unable to say now to what extent I have been influenced by it. For the explanation and interpretation of the Biblical texts, I am naturally under great obligations to the principal commentators upon the various books of the Old Testament. Among these, those whom I found most helpful and suggestive for the particular objects which I had in view were Delitzsch and Hitzig, Hupfeld and Dillmann, especially the two first, whose grammatical perceptions are both delicate and keen. Other commentators, as Keil, Knobel, Thenius, were also often useful in a more general way, though they scarcely display any special aptitude for appreciating the finer distinctions of language, or skill and power in the treatment of a philological difficulty.

To English books (except Dr. Kalisch's Hebrew Grammar, and Professor Wright's Arabic Grammar, which are indispensable to every student) I am under no obligations whatever: I could wish that the case had been otherwise, but, at least in questions of scholarship, the majority of English writers upon the Old Testament seem to me to be incapable of offering an opinion of any value which has not been derived from some foreign source. Most of them have yet to learn that without *independent research* it is impossible to attain a firm and unfaltering grasp of the principles and methods of a language: nothing is really our own until we have either discovered it for ourselves, or followed intelligently and with continual verification the process by which it has been discovered by others: it is not enough, in those who wish to speak with effect, to appeal to the authority, or to appropriate the conclusions, even of such scholars as Delitzsch or Ewald. Errors may consist in the misappreciation of a grammatical principle, or in misstatement upon matters of fact; and experience seems to shew that those who would avoid them under either form must, as they read the language, *observe and note for themselves* its usages and laws[1].

---

[1] An example of the manner in which the ancient versions are often referred to will shew how needful here too it is to pursue the same method, and how premature it may be to accept their evidence implicitly until by a thorough and minute examination of the whole translation of a book we have formed some estimate of its character and value. In Ps. xxii. 17, as is well known, there are two competing readings, כארו and כארי: LXX have ὤρυξαν, and there is no doubt that this points indisputably to the former. But, granted that LXX read כארו, there is still another question which it is clearly our duty to ask, and do our utmost to answer, viz. what is the worth of this evidence? It is easy to shew that, so far as the Psalms are con-

To define the exact extent of my indebtedness to each and all of the writers named would be impossible: where

---

cerned, *as between* י *and* ו, *the testimony of LXX is of no weight whatever.* The two letters are closely alike, especially in MSS.: and LXX, or the MS. which they employed, continually read the one where our Hebrew text reads the other. In ii. 6. xvi. 3. xvii. 12. xx. 10. xxxii. 4. xxxv. 16, 19. xxxvi. 2. xxxvii. 20. xxxviii. 12. xlv. 12. xlvi. 5. l. 5, 21. lviii. 4. lxix. 33. lxxiii. 7, 10 *a*. lxxiv. 5. xc. 16. xci. 6. cxiii. 8. cxxii. 6. cxliv. 15. cxlv. 5, they exhibit ו for י: on the other hand, in xvi. 3. xvii. 11, 12. xxii. 25, 30. xxvii. 6. xxxv. 19, 20? xli. 9. lvi. 8. lix. 10 (cf. 18 Heb.). lxii. 1, 5. lxiv. 7. lxv. 8. lxviii. 7. lxxiii. 10 *b*. lxxvi. 7. lxxxv. 9 *b*. lxxxviii. 11. xci. 4? cix. 10, 28. cxix. 3. cxxv. 3. cxlv. 5, they exhibit י for ו. Now whatever be the exact explanation of these variations (which, it should be remembered, form but one class out of many), whether they are to be attributed to the unskilful haste of the copyists through whose hands the Egyptian recension of the Old Testament was transmitted, or whether, in moments of difficulty, the translators allowed themselves an unprecedented freedom of conjecture, it is plain that most of them are devoid of the slightest critical value, and effect no improvement upon the Masoretic text. If, then, in this crowd of instances the translation of LXX has shewn itself so uncertain a witness, how can its evidence be regarded as conclusive in the case of Ps. xxii? Unless we are prepared to reconstruct the whole Hebrew text upon the basis of the Septuagint, how does the *mere fact* of their authority being in its favour commend to us the reading כארו, any more than it commends to us דמוני xvii. 12, וראה xc. 16, or אשרו cxliv. 15 *a* (not *b*)? Certainly כארו may well be right here, just as לבו is most likely right in xxxvi. 2; but the only way in which LXX can lend probability to either one or the other is, indirectly, by demonstrating the ease with which in MSS. the letters in question become often interchanged.

I may notice in passing that in the Psalms the Syriac version (the Peshito) is not an 'independent authority:' even though every page had not the amplest indications of it (see in Ps. xxii alone, *vv.* 2, 9, 10, 22, 28, 30, 32?) its dependence upon LXX might have been fairly suspected from the language of Tregelles in Smith, *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. p. 1629 *a*: cf. also Moll, p. 32 *b*.

it is special and direct some acknowledgment or indication of it has generally been given. I have seldom, if ever, contented myself with merely following in the steps of any one of them; indeed, on several occasions, I have felt it necessary to assume a decided attitude of dissent. My more usual practice has been, while adopting the theory or suggestion of another, to expand and work it out in my own way, adding such explanations and illustrations as seemed suitable. On some questions, such as those discussed in §§ 14, 81 f., 103 f., and Chapters III, VIII, X (which had always seemed to me to be fraught with peculiar difficulty, and to be involved at times in uncertainty and confusion), I venture to think that the treatment here given will be found more complete, both in matter and arrangement, than that which most grammars have to offer. In the citation of proof-passages (for the majority of which I am alone responsible) I have taken every precaution to ensure accuracy: it is too much to expect an entire freedom from error; and sometimes, of course, a difference of opinion may be legitimately held to exist as to the precise force attaching to a particular tense. If their number should in some cases seem excessive, it must be recollected that it is often of the first importance to know how far an alleged custom extends, whether it is really common or only exceptional; and that, in days when strange assertions[1] are sometimes met with

[1] As e.g. that the *inf. c.* in ־ֵי of verbs ל"ה is 'to be found in the Pentateuch and to be found nowhere else,' and that there too the 3rd pl. pret. 'frequently' [i.e. twice] ends in ־וּן (see the qualifications to these statements in Keil, *Einl.* § 15. 2); or when in a note on Gen. ii. 3 לאמר (which fills twelve columns in Buxtorf) is spoken of as 'very exceptional,' while on Deut. xi. 2 another expression,

respecting Hebrew idioms, it is desirable to give the reader every facility for testing each statement for himself.

Of the three Appendices, the first will, I hope, convey a clear view to English readers of an important feature in Hebrew syntax: the second is an attempt to solve, at least partially, a question which has for long been to me a source of extreme perplexity and embarrassment: in the third, I have endeavoured to give, in a popular form, a sketch of the relationship subsisting between Hebrew and Arabic[1], with a few illustrations, derived from the Qor'an, of the more characteristic usages of the two tenses.

I fear I have laid myself open to a charge of inconsistency in respect to the forms in which many of the

---

which I believe never occurs at all, and certainly not in the sense alleged, is termed 'a common Hebrew phrase.' Such inaccuracies are very misleading, especially for those who may not be acquainted with the original, or who, being acquainted with it, are still not in the habit of accustoming themselves to the process of verification.

[1] The interesting question whether or not the Semitic and Aryan languages are ultimately connected with one another, suggests here two or three words on the method by which, if it exists, the connection is to be established. Many, it is to be feared, have but an imperfect conception of the extreme caution and rigour with which, if error is to be avoided, an enquiry like this must be conducted: the crude comparisons which are often instituted in utter disregard of both history and philology—such as that of 'cover' with כסה, as though the English word was not derived, through Fr. 'couvrir,' from the *compound* Latin 'co-operio'—are clearly insufficient, and can never lead to any decisive or satisfactory result. The least that can be done before comparing an Aryan with a Semitic root, is to take the earliest and simplest form of it which is known, the 'Grundform' if this can be discovered, rather than as it appears in a language of yesterday: if, after having pursued this method in a large number of instances, the coincidences are too numerous and

proper names have been suffered to appear. Owing principally to the prominence and frequency of the jarring and ugly *j*, and to the rude dislocation of accent and quantity which it seems even to encourage, the English pronunciation of Hebrew names cannot but be extremely discordant to all those whose ears still retain an echo of the euphonious softness and balanced rhythm so conspicuous in their originals. Being, however, unwilling to offend English eyes (to which novelties such as *Iyob* or *Yechezqel*, too often repeated, might seem repulsive), I have acquiesced in general with the current custom, merely at occasional intervals permitting myself to remind the reader of the true orthography. There was one proper name only, the Tetragrammaton, which I could not bring myself to deform by perpetuating the amorphous mediaevalism which has become popular in England, but which the laws regulating the formation of Hebrew words declare to be at once meaningless and impossible. The names יצחק, יעקב are evidently derived from imperfects—the former with a lengthened ultima—signifying respectively *he laughs* and *he supplants*, and we desiderate (see Ex. iii. 14) for יהוה a punctuation which shall make it denote analogously *He is* (ὁ ὤν): this the punctuation יַהְוֶה (or יַהְוֶה) immediately does[1], whereas the punctuation *Jehovah*

regular to be fairly assignable to chance, we may then be authorised in pronouncing the two families related. Those who are desirous of seeing how such a process might be carried out may consult with advantage the monograph of Friedrich Delitzsch, entitled *Studien über Indogermanisch-Semitische Wurzelverwandschaft* (Leipzig 1873).

[1] For the full proof of this, see Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, s. v.; Smith, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v.; Delitzsch, *die Psalmen*, p. 798 (ed. 2, 1867); or Russell Martineau, in the Essay appended to vol. ii of the translation of Ewald's *Hist. of Israel*, p. 433. Cf. Böttcher, i. 49.

is not compatible with any meaning whatever. It seems to me, however, unreasonable to write *Jahveh* (as is done by some), with the expectation that English people will assign to the *J* and the *V* a value quite unauthorised by their language: I have therefore uniformly represented the Hebrew word by that which is its real equivalent in English, viz. Yahweh.

I had hoped to touch upon two or three other points of interest, and in particular to enforce and illustrate from the Old Testament (as might readily be done) the importance of the great and vital principle of translation, which upon another field has been conclusively vindicated and established by Canon Lightfoot[1]. But space forbids me to do more than point out one or two instances of its violation in a note.

S. R. D.

New College,
February, 1874.

---

[1] See his admirable Essay *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, p. 33 'Artificial distinctions created,' p. 60 'Real distinctions obliterated,' and (in ed. 2) pref. pp. ix–xxii. An artificial distinction may conceal not merely striking similarities of thought or imitations, but even direct allusions. Who in reading our version of Ps. xxxix. 14 would suspect the remarkable identity of expression with Job vii. 19. xiv. 6, and ix. 27. x. 20? or in Job vi. 2 detect that, unlike xvi. 6, it is not the 'pain' of ii. 13 but the 'vexation' of v. 2 to which Job pointedly alludes (cf. 1 Sam. i. 6 and 16), or imagine in xxxiii. 7 that Elihu is quoting a phrase from ix. 34. xiii. 21? Compare also v. 2 with Prov. xii. 16. xxvii. 3, x. 17 with Ps. lxxxv. 5, xvii. 7 with Ps. vi. 8. xxxi. 10: both here and elsewhere, some uniform rendering for כעס is much to be desired.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	*Introduction*	1
II.	*The Perfect alone* (See also §§ 114 α, 136 γ, 138–141, 144, 153, 154.)	8
III.	*The Imperfect alone* (See also §§ 83 f., 85, 136, 142–145, 154.)	24
IV.	*The Cohortative and Jussive* (the Modal or Voluntative forms of the Imperfect) (See also §§ 121 *Obs.*, 150–152.)	48
V.	*The Voluntative with Waw*	66
VI.	*The Imperfect with Strong Waw or Waw Conversive* (See also §§ 114 β, 117 f., 127, 138 ii.)	73
VII.	*Accents*	109
VIII.	*The Perfect with Strong Waw or Waw Conversive* (See also §§ 136 α, 138 i, 147–149.)	125
IX.	*The Perfect and Imperfect with Weak Waw* (the Simple Waw, not Conversive)	170
X.	*Hypotheticals*	177
APPENDIX I.	*On the Circumstantial Clause*	200
„ II.	*On the Original Signification of the Jussive*	217
„ III.	*On Arabic as Illustrative of Hebrew* (See also §§ 20, 64 *n.*, 71 *n.*, 122 *Obs.*, 151 *Obs.*, 174.)	230
ADDENDA (on §§ 21, 43, 49 β, 62, 70, 82, 104, 119 δ)		249
INDEX		251

ERRATA.

Page 17, l. 17, *for* § 83 *read* § 82

„ 19, l. 4, *the reference is to* § 136 γ

„ 20, ll. 4 and 5 from bottom, *for* אָחַר *read* אַחַר

„ 22, last line, *for* 124, 6 *c*, *read* 126, 4 *note*

„ 69, § 62 end. *See, however*, 1 Sam. xiv. 36.

„ 85, l. 19, *for* tones *read* tone

„ 86 *note*, l. 3, for *kitabun* read *kitâbun*

„ 93, l. 17, *for* § 151 *read* § 149

„ 106, l. 10, *for* וַיִּצַּב *read* וַיִּצַּב

„ 118, l. 9, *dele* 'note . . . ב.' Although the pause indicated by *dechi* is of course sufficiently marked to affect a following aspirate with dagesh (see e.g. *v.* 5 בסחר), yet the passage cited does not present an instance of its action in this way: יהוה, being read *'Adonây*, is treated as terminating with a consonant, and accordingly *always*, even when provided with a conjunctive accent, necessitates the dagesh, e.g. xix. 8 יהוָה תמימה (contrast *v.* 5 ובקצָה תבל). xxi. 14 (contrast *v.* 7), etc. On the exception Ps. lxviii. 18, see Delitzsch *ad loc.*, Ewald, § 48 *b*.

*** The references to Ewald's *Lehrbuch* are to the *seventh* edition (Göttingen 1863).

ON THE USE OF THE TENSES IN HEBREW.

CHAPTER I.

Introduction.

1. THE Hebrew language, in striking contrast to the classical languages in which the development of the verb is so rich and varied, possesses only two of those modifications which are commonly termed 'tenses.' These tenses were formerly known by the familiar names of *past* and *future*, but inasmuch as the so-called *past* tense is continually used to describe events in the future, and the so-called *future* tense to describe events in the past, it is clear that these terms, adapted from languages cast in a totally different mould from the Hebrew and other Semitic tongues, are in the highest degree inappropriate and misleading. It will be better therefore to acquiesce in the names now generally employed by modern grammarians, and deduced from real and not fictitious or accidental characteristics of the two forms in question, and to call them by the terms *perfect* and *imperfect*[1] respectively.

[1] These words are of course employed in their etymological meaning, as signifying *complete* and *incomplete*: they must not therefore be *limited* to the special senses they have acquired in Greek and Latin grammar.

2. For if we adopt these designations, we shall be continually reminded of the fundamental[1] character of the two 'tenses,' and be thereby enabled to discern a rational ground for such phenomena as those alluded to, § 1, which, especially to persons who are perhaps more familiar with the languages of modern or classical times, appear when approached for the first time so inexplicable, so contradictory, not to say so absurd. In order fully to understand this fundamental character, we shall have to revert to a distinction which, though not unknown in other languages, does not appear to have obtained from Hebrew grammarians the recognition and prominence it deserves. I allude to the distinction between *order* of time and *kind* of time. In the first place, a particular verbal form may exhibit a given action as prior or subsequent to some date otherwise fixed by the narrative: this is a difference in the order of time. But, secondly, an action may be contemplated, according to the fancy of the speaker, or according to the particular point which he desires to make prominent, either as *incipient*, or as *continuing*, or as *completed;* the speaker may wish to lay stress upon the moment at which it begins, or upon the period over which it extends, or upon the fact of its being

[1] It will appear hereafter that the term *imperfect* does not in strictness correspond to a primary but to a derived characteristic of the tense called by that name. Böttcher in his *Ausf. Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache*, it must be admitted with greater precision, gives to the imperfect the name of *fiens:* but inasmuch as what is *incipient* is also necessarily *imperfect*, the latter term may be fairly held to express a fundamental attribute of the tense. No sufficient ground therefore seems to exist for abandoning the now usual nomenclature in favour of the new and peculiar term preferred by Böttcher.

finished and done: these are differences in the kind of time. Thus, for example, ἔπειθε and πείθει differ in the order or date, not in the kind of action specified: each alike expresses a continuous action, but the one throws it into the past, the other places it in the present. On the other hand, πεῖσαι and πείθειν, μὴ πείσῃς and μὴ πείθε differ in kind, not in date; in each the date is equally indeterminate, but the aorist indicates a momentary act, the present one that is continuous. Now in Hebrew the tenses mark only differences in the kind of time, not differences in the order of time: i. e. they do not in themselves determine the *date* at which an action takes place, they only indicate its *character* or *kind*—the three phases just mentioned, those namely of incipiency, continuance, and completion, being represented respectively by the imperfect, the participle, and the perfect[1].

3. Thus the 'tenses' in Hebrew, at least as regards what they do *not* express, are in their inmost nature radically distinct from what is commonly known in other languages by the same name: indeed they might almost more fitly be called *moods*[2]. Certainly the difference between various

[1] The distinction here drawn between the two relations, under which every action may present itself, is also insisted on, and further illustrated, by G. Curtius, in his *Elucidations of Greek Grammar* (translated by Abbott), pp. 203–212.

[2] This is the designation employed by Ewald formerly, and by Hitzig still; the perfect being spoken of as the *first mood*, the imperfect as the *second mood*. And in so far as each of the two forms in question seizes and gives expression to a particular phase of an action, 'mood,' suggestive as it is of the idea of *modification*, might seem the preferable term to adopt. Since, however, as we shall see, the Semitic languages developed for the imperfect special modal forms, which still exist in Hebrew, though not in the same perfection they

kinds of time is clearly marked in Greek: but then it exists side by side with a full recognition and expression of the other difference, which in our eyes is of paramount importance (as regards *kind* of time we are by no means sensitive), and which, nevertheless, Hebrew seems totally to disregard. And this is just the novelty with which we are here so struck,—the position occupied in the language by the one distinction it appreciates, with the consequences which follow from it; and the fact that Hebrew, unlike Greek and most other languages, possesses no forms specifically appropriated to indicate date, but meets the want which this deficiency must have occasioned by a subtle and unique application of the two forms expressive of kind. Only, inasmuch as obviously an action may be regarded under either of the three aspects named above, whether it belong to the past, the present, or the future—a writer may e. g. look upon a future event as so certain that he may prefer to speak of it in the perfect as though already *done*—an ambiguity will arise as to which of these periods it is to be referred to, an ambiguity which nothing but the context, and sometimes not even that, is able to remove. The tenses in Is. ix. 5 are precisely identical with those in Gen. xxi. 1–3: it is only the context which tells us that in the one case a series of events in the future, in the other one in the past is being described. On the other hand, יָרַד Ex. xxxiii. 9 refers to the past, xix. 11 to the future, although the tense does not vary; and יָסוּר שָׁמָה relating, 2 Kings iv. 8, to the future, is used in the

exhibit in Arabic, and as it is convenient to have a separate name for the *genus*, of which these modal forms are the *species*, the more customary titles may be retained.

next verse but one to describe what happened in the past.

4. This peculiarity, however, is only an extension of what meets us (say) in Greek. We are all familiar with the ineffaceable distinction between ἐλάλησαν (as Acts xvi. 32) and ἐλάλουν (as xix. 6): we are apt to forget that a similar distinction may appertain to events in the future as well as in the past. And, further, has not the *exact* date of both the actions quoted to be fixed from the context? Within what limits of time did the action ἐλάλησαν take place? and does ἐλάλουν signify 'they *used* to talk' (over a long period of time), or 'they *were* talking' (at the moment arrived at by the history, or when the writer came upon the scene), or 'they *began and continued* talking' (as consequent upon some occurrence previously described)? 'The imperfect,' it has been said, 'paints a scene:' true, but upon what part of the canvass? upon a part *determined by the whole picture.* And what has just been said we shall find to be pre-eminently true of the tenses as employed in Hebrew.

5. The tenses, then, in so far as they serve to fix the date of an action, have a relative not an absolute significance. It will, however, be evident that, since it is more usual, especially in prose, to regard a past event as completed, and a future event as uncompleted, the perfect will be commonly employed to describe the former, and the imperfect to describe the latter; but this distinction of usage is not maintained with sufficient uniformity to justify the retention of the old titles *past* and *future*, which will now clearly appear to express relations that are of only secondary importance, and only partially true. It is, on the other hand, of the utmost consequence to

understand and bear constantly in mind the fundamental and primary facts stated above: (1) that the Hebrew verb notifies the character without fixing the date of an action, and (2) that, of its two forms with which we have here more particularly to deal, one is calculated to describe an action as incipient and so as imperfect; the other to describe it as completed and so as perfect. Upon these two facts the whole theory of the tenses has to be constructed; and the latter fact, at any rate, will be most readily remembered by the use of terms which at once recall to the mind the distinction involved in it.

6. The use of the Hebrew tenses will be better understood and more thoroughly appreciated if we keep in mind some of the peculiarities by which Hebrew style, especially the poetical and prophetical style, is characterised. One such peculiarity is the singular ease and rapidity with which a writer *changes his standpoint*, at one moment speaking of a scene as though still in the remote future, at another moment describing it as though present to his gaze. Another characteristic is a love for variety and vividness in expression: so soon as the pure prose style is deserted, the writer, no longer contenting himself with a series of (say) perfects, diversifies his language in a manner which absolutely mocks any effort to reproduce it in a Western tongue; seizing each separate individual detail he invests it with a special character of its own—you see it perhaps emerging into the light, perhaps standing there with clearly-cut outline before you—and presents his readers with a picture of surpassing brilliancy and life. If now the reader is careful not to lose sight of what has been stated in this and the preceding section, he will no longer feel surprised or perplexed by the ceaseless

change of tense which forms such a characteristic feature of Hebrew poetry: difficulties indeed and ambiguities will still remain, but these can only be overcome by an attentive study of the context and an accurate estimate of the sense which the *whole* passage appears intended to convey.

CHAPTER II.

The Perfect alone.

N. B. The reader is particularly requested to notice that *throughout this book*, in every pointed word quoted without its proper accent, the tone is *always on the ultima* (milra') *unless specially marked otherwise* by metheg[1]. Attention to the position of the tone is of the *utmost importance* for a right understanding of the language; and the necessity of observing it cannot be too emphatically inculcated. By acquiring the habit of doing this regularly, the eye will become trained so as to notice it instinctively and without effort, and will be at once arrested by any deviation a word may present from the customary rule.

7. THE perfect tense, in accordance with its fundamental character, as stated § 2, is used

(1) As equivalent to the Greek aorist, to denote an action completed and finished at a definite moment in the past, fixed by the narrative; as Gen. iii. 16 unto the woman אָמַר *he said.* x. 8 יָלַד. xxv. 30 קָרָא. xxxii. 11 *I passed over.* xlix. 30 f. Ps. iv. 8 רָבוּ. ix. 6. xviii. 5, 6, 9. xxx. 3. xxxi. 8 (*didst once*), 9. xxxii. 4. xxxix. 3 f. xliv. 3 f.

Even though the action indicated by the verb should itself extend over a considerable period; as Ex. i. 7 פָּרוּ.

---

[1] Where a word *milra'* has from any cause a previous syllable marked by metheg, I have, in order to avoid the possibility of mistake, attached one likewise to the ultima.

xii. 40. Num. ix. 23. Deut. ii. 14. 1 Kings xv. 2 three years מָלַךְ *he reigned.* Ps. xxxv. 13 f; or even though it be repeated, as 1 Sam. xviii. 30[1].

8. (2) Like the Greek perfect, to denote an action completed in the past, but with the accessory idea of its consequences continuing up to the time at which the words are uttered: it is thus employed to describe an action resulting in a *state*, which may be of longer or shorter duration, according to the context. Thus Gen. iv. 6 why נָפְלוּ *hath* thy face *fallen?* xxxii. 11 *I have become* (LXX γέγονα) two camps. Is. i. 4 *have forsaken* Yahweh. Ps. iii. 7. v. 11. x. 11 הסתיר. xvi. 6. xvii. 5 בַּל נָמוֹטוּ *have* not *tottered*, 11. xviii. 37. xxii. 2. xxvii. 9. xxxi. 15. xxxviii. 10–13. xxxix. 10. xl. 13. cxix. 3, 30.

Obs. It is of importance to keep the aoristic and perfect senses of this tense distinct, and also to ascertain upon every occasion which of the two is meant, whether, in other words, the action or state described by the tense is one which has ceased, or one which still continues. There is frequently some difficulty upon this point, especially in the Psalms: and unless care be taken in translation, the sense of a passage may be greatly obscured. For instance, Ps. xxxv. 15 f, 21, the tenses employed in both the Prayer-Book Version and the Authorised Version would seem to suggest that the state of things described was one which had been *formerly* experienced: thus the motive for the petition, *v.* 17, is gone, and it becomes meaningless. But in fact *v.* 17 shews clearly that the preceding *vv.* refer to what still goes on, and that the right translation of the perfects is consequently '*have* rejoiced' etc., exactly as *v.* 7. On the other

[1] Whether in cases like these the pf. or impf. is employed, depends naturally upon the *animus loquentis:* if the speaker does not desire to lay any special stress on the frequency or continuance of an event, the simplest and most obvious way of designating it will be by the employment of the perfect.

hand, Ps. xxxi. 8 f. as it stands in the Authorised Version and Prayer-Book Version will only make sense by the side of *v.* 10 if the perfects are explained according to § 14. This is possible, but it is better to suppose that the two cohortatives express a wish or prayer rather than an intention, and that ראית, ידעת are aoristic, relating to a former condition of things now come to an end. The English 'thou hast considered' in no way suggests the possibility of such a termination: to admit of this, we must either emphasize the auxiliary, and say, 'thou *hast* considered,' or render 'thou didst consider,' inserting, if deemed necessary, 'once' or 'formerly.' Similarly, xxxii. 4 (*was*, not *is;* the context plainly shews that the period of depression is past).

And this doublesidedness of the perfect will probably throw light on Lam. iii. 55–58: the pff. in these verses are aoristic, describing a state of things *anterior* as well to *vv.* 52–54 as to *vv.* 59–61 (ראיתה *v.* 59 exactly as Ps. x. 14. xxxv. 22: the change from *v.* 54 to *v.* 55 is no more abrupt or unprepared than the very similar one between Job xxx. 31 and xxxi. 1).

9. (3) In cases where in English the perfect *has* is used idiomatically to describe an action occurring in the past at a moment which the speaker is not able or not desirous to specify more closely; as 1 Sam. xii. 3, whose ox לָקַחְתִּי *have I taken?* (or *did I* (ever) *take?*), 4[1]. Ps. iii. 8 thou hast smitten (on some previous occasion). iv. 2. vii. 4. ix. 6. xxi. 3. xxxvii. 35. xliv. 2. cxvi. 8, 16. Prov. xxi. 22. Job ix. 4. xxx. 25. xxxiv. 31. xxxvii. 20 (did man ever say?). Jer. ii. 11.

Where the consequences of such an action continue into the present we may sometimes render by the present tense, although, if it does not sound unnatural or stiff, it is better to preserve the perfect. Amos v. 14 as *ye say.* Ps. ii. 1 why do the people rage? (*have raged*—an action

---

[1] Cf. Thuk. v. 103 *οὐ καθεῖλεν, never ruined.*

which the context shews has not ceased at the moment of the poet's writing). xxxviii. 3–9 *are* filled, *am* benumbed, etc. lxxxviii. 7–10, 14, 16–19. Prov. xiv. 7 *b*.

In these cases, the limits of time within which the action must lie are obvious from the context: passages like Gen. iv. 1 קָנִיתִי, 10 מָה עָשִׂיתָ *what hast thou done* (a few moments ago)? or *what didst thou do?* (just now; but the former is the English idiom). xxxii. 27, 31. xli. 28. Num. xxii. 34. Ps. ii. 7 *c*. ix. 16 f. xxx. 4. xlviii. 4 נוֹדַע hath made himself known; and the common phrase כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה Ex. iv. 22 etc. lead us on to the next usage.

10. (4) Here the perfect is employed to describe the immediate past, being generally best translated by the present; as Gen. xiv. 22 הֲרִמֹתִי *I lift up* (have this moment, as I speak, lifted[1]) my hand to heaven. 1 Sam. xvii. 10 חֵרַפְתִּי I reproach. 2 Sam. ix. 9. xvi. 4 I fall down. xvii. 11 I advise. xix. 30 I say. 1 Kings i. 35 and him do I appoint.

2 Chron. ii. 12 (in a letter[2]) I send.

11. (5) Closely allied to (3) is the use of the perfect with such words as יָדַעְתִּי Gen. iv. 9. xxi. 26 *I have* not *known*=*I do* not *know*; זָכַרְנוּ Num. xi. 5 *we remember*, cf. Ps. lxxxviii. 6; כַּאֲשֶׁר אָהֵב Gen. xxvii. 9 as *he loveth*, cf. Ps. xi. 7. In verbs like these, expressive of a state or condition, whether physical or mental, which, though it may have been attained at some previous time, nevertheless continues to exist up to the moment of speaking, the

---

[1] Compare in Greek the so-called 'aorist of immediate past,' so common in the tragedians, e.g. Aesch. Choeph. 423. Soph. El. 668 ἐδεξάμην (*I welcome*) τὸ ῥηθέν. 677 etc.

[2] Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 18. Acts xxiii. 30.

emphasis rests so often upon the latter point, that the English *present* most adequately represents the force of the original perfect.

To the verbs already cited may be added, as belonging to the same class, the following, which are selected from the list given by Böttcher, *Ausf. Lehrbuch*, § 948: by this grammarian they are not inaptly termed *verba stativa* or 'statives.' אָמַלַל *to languish;* בטח *to trust* Ps. xxvi. 2 etc.; גבה *to be high* Is. lv. 9; גָּדַל *to be great* Ps. xcii. 6; דָּמָה *to be like* Ps. cxliv. 4; זקן *to be old* Ruth i. 12; חָסָה *to take refuge* Ps. vii. 2 etc.; טהר *to be clean* Prov. xx. 9; יָכֹל *to be able* Ps. xl. 13; מֵאֵן *to refuse* Ex. x. 3; מאס *to despise* Job vii. 16; מָלֵא *to be full* Ps. civ. 24; צדק *to be just* Job x. 15. xxxiv. 5; קָטֹן *to be small* Gen. xxxii. 11; רבב *to be*[1] *many* Ps. civ. 24; שמח *to rejoice* 1 Sam. ii. 1; שָׂנֵא *to hate* Ps. v. 6; add likewise היה Gen. xlii. 11. Is. xv. 6; נאלמתי Ps. xxxix. 10; חפצתי xl. 9 etc.[2]

It will be understood, however, that many of these verbs are found also as aorists, i. e. with the emphasis not on the continuance of the state described, but on its commencement, or upon the fact of its existence generally at some period in the past; e. g. Gen. xxviii. 16 לא ידעתי *I knew* it not. xxxvii. 3. 1 Sam. x. 19. xxii. 22. Ps. xxxix. 3 (contrast *v.* 10). xli. 10. In itself the perfect enunciates simply the completion of an act: it is by way of accommodation to the usage of another language that,

---

[1] 'To *become* many,' i. e. be multiplied, is רָבָה.

[2] Cf. *μέμαα, πέφυκα, πέποιθα, οἶδα, ἔρρωμαι*, etc. *We* commonly denote a state by the use of the present: the Greek, in verbs like these, 'conceives it as the result of the act necessary for attaining it, and therefore denotes it by the perfect.'

eliciting its special force from the context, we make the meaning more definite by exhibiting it explicitly, as occasion demands, under the form of an aorist, a perfect, or a present.

12. (6) It is used to express general truths known to have actually occurred, and so proved from experience: here again the idiomatic rendering in English is by means of the present[1]: Ps. vii. 16 כָּרָה he *hath dug* or *diggeth* a pit and holloweth it out. x. 3, 6, 11. xiv. 1–5 (or may we rather infer from the succession of pff. only that the writer is alluding to some definite event that had occurred? if they are pff. of experience, it is strange to find no imperfects interspersed: cf. Job xxviii. 3 f, 8–11). xxxiii. 13 f. xxxiv. 11. xxxvii. 23. xxxix. 12. xli. 4. lxxxiv. 4 מָצְאָה, שָׁתָה[2]. cxix. 21. Prov. xxii. 12, 13. Job xxxiii. 3. Qohéleth viii. 14 (*has taken* place, or *takes* place).

13. (7) The perfect is employed to indicate actions the accomplishment of which lies indeed in the future, but is regarded as dependent upon such an unalterable determination of the will that it may be spoken of as having actually taken place: thus a resolution, promise, or decree, especially a divine one, is very frequently announced in

---

[1] Both the pf. and aorist (the gnomic aorist) are similarly used in Greek: Xen. Mem. iv. 2, 35 πολλοὶ δὲ διὰ δόξαν καὶ πολιτικὴν δύναμιν μέγαλα κακὰ πεπόνθασιν (preceded by three *presents*); cf. the aorist Plato Rep. 566 D. E. in the description of the conduct of the τύραννος, and see further Il. ix. 320. xiii. 62, 242. xiv. 217.

In the 'gnomic' aorist (which is sometimes found coupled with the present, as Il. xvii. 177 ὅστε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἄνδρα φοβεῖ, καὶ ἀφείλετο νίκην Ἠϊδίωος·) 'a fact of the past is exhibited as a rule for all time.'

[2] Not *may lay*, which would be תשית: the word states a fact, exactly as מצאה does.

the perfect tense. A striking instance is afforded by Ruth iv. 3, where Bo'az, speaking of No'ŏmi's determination to sell her land, says, מָכְרָה נָעֳמִי lit. *has sold* (has resolved to sell: the Engl. idiom would be *is selling*). Gen. xxiii. 11 *I give* thee the field; 13, Abraham replies, נָתַתִּי *I give* thee the value of the field (although the money does not actually pass till *v.* 16). xv. 18 to thy seed *I give* this land. Judg. iv. 14 נתן. xv. 3 נְקַמְתִּי referring to his contemplated act of violence. Exod. xii. 17. 1 Kings iii. 13. Is. xliii. 20 נתתי. Ezek. xxi. 9 (cf. 8) הִכְרַתִּי. Lev. xxvi. 44 nevertheless, when they are in the land of their enemies, לֹא מְאַסְתִּים *I do not reject them.* Ps. xx. 7 Now know I that Yahweh *is sure to save* his anointed. Num. xxxii. 19 בָּאָה (*mil'el*, and so pf., not part.[1]). Zech. i. 16. v. 3. viii. 3 שָׁבְתִּי. 1 Chron. xii. 19. 2 Chron. xii. 5 *b*. Here, too, we may notice the use of the pf. in Jer. iv. 13 Woe to us, for שֻׁדַּדְנוּ *we are undone!* (at the terrible prospect of the Chaldee's approach: comp.

---

[1] It may be worth while here, once for all, to remind the reader that in verbs ע"ו the pf. fem. בָּאָה is *mil'el*, the part. fem. בָּאָה *milra'*; הַשָּׁמָה, therefore, Is. li. 10, is the perfect, although preceded by the article; cf. Gen. xviii. 21, and see Josh. x. 24, and Kalisch's Hebr. Gramm. § 80, 10. This distinction may be easily borne in mind, if it be recollected that in each case the position of the tone depends simply upon the particular application of a *general* rule: on the one hand, all *fem. adjectives* in ־ָה are regularly accented on the ultima, e. g. קָטֹנָה; on the other hand, all *tense-forms* ending in ־ָה, ־וּ, ־ִי, with a *vowel* (not *shwa'*) before the last radical, except in certain special cases, take the tone upon the penultima, e. g. אָשִׁיבָה, קִוִּמִי, הַגִּימוּ, וְנָהֲרוּ. We are now further in a position to understand how upon precisely the same principle נָאֱמָנָה Ps. xix. 8 must be the part. and נָאֱלָמָה Is. liii. 7 the pausal form of the perfect.

ὄλωλα, and such phrases as Il. xv. 128 μαινόμενε, φρένας ἠλέ, διέφθορας). Is. vi. 5. Ps. xxxi. 23. Lam. iii. 54.

14. (8) But the most special and remarkable use of the tense, though little more than an extension of the last idiom, is as the *prophetic perfect:* its abrupt appearance in this capacity confers upon descriptions of the future a most forcible and expressive touch of reality, and imparts in the most vivid manner a sense of the certainty with which the occurrence of a yet future event is contemplated by the speaker[1]. Sometimes the perfect appears thus only for a single word; sometimes, as though nothing more than an ordinary series of past historical events were being described, it extends over many verses in succession: continually the series of perfects is interspersed with the simple future forms, as the prophet shifts his point of view, at one moment contemplating the events he is describing from the *real standpoint* of the present, at another moment looking back upon them as accomplished and done, and so viewing them from an *ideal position* in the future.

It will be best to classify under distinct heads the various modes in which this perfect of certainty, or prophetic perfect, may appear.

(*a*) The description of the future scene may *begin* with the perfect, whether the verbs following (if there be any) fall back into the future or not: Num. xxiv. 17 a star דָּרַךְ

---

[1] The Greek aorist is similarly used, at least in the apodosis, to 'express future events which must certainly happen' (Jelf, § 403, 2), Plato Rep. 462 C. etc.; and even coupled with a future, Il. iv. 161 ἔκ τε καὶ ὀψὲ τελεῖ, σύν τε μεγάλῳ ἀπέτισαν. ix. 413. See further below, Chap. X.

hath proceeded out of Ja'aqob, and *shall* etc. Judg. iv. 14 hath he not gone out before thee? Is. v. 13 Therefore גָּלָה *hath* my people *gone* into captivity (although the captivity is only *anticipated*), 25 על כן חרה etc. viii. 23. ix. 1–6 the people that walked in darkness *have seen* a great light etc. x. 28–31 (of the march of the Assyrian) he *hath come* to 'Ayyâth etc. xxi. 1 בא, 12 אתא. xxiv. 4–12 (except 9). xxviii. 2 הניח (the prophet sees Samaria already laid low on the ground). xxx. 5. xxxiii. 3. xlii. 17. xlv. 16 f. xlvi. 1 f. (the fall of Babel and its idols spoken of as *achieved*: for parallel part. cf. Jer. v. 6). Jer. ii. 26 הבישו. v. 6 הִכָּם (where observe that the impf. and part. follow: in each of the three parallel expressions the prophet seizes upon a fresh aspect of the scene). xiii. 26 חשפתי. xxii. 23. xxviii. 2 (in 4, the impf. אשבר). xxxii. 24 f. xlvi. 14–16, 23 f. li. 8, 41 etc. Ezek. xxiv. 14 etc. Amos v. 2. Zeph. iii. 18. Zech. i. 16. ix. 11, 13 *a*. Ps. xxii. 22, 30. xxvi. 12. xxx. 12. xxxvi. 13 (he sees the wicked already fallen). xxxvii. 38. xli. 4. lxxi. 24. lxxxv. 11 etc.

It thus occurs after oaths or other strong asseverations; as אִם לֹא Jer. xv. 11; כִּי אִם 2 Kings v. 20.

(β) It frequently appears after כִּי, the reason for an assertion or a command being found in some event the occurrence of which, though still future, is deemed *certain*, and contemplated accordingly by the writer; Is. xi. 9 they will do no destruction in all my holy mountain, for the earth *is filled* with the knowledge of Yahweh (at the time alluded to *has been* filled). xv. 6 *b*, 8, 9. xvi. 8, 9 נפל. xxiii. 1, 4, 14 howl, for your stronghold *has been wasted!* xxiv. 18 f, 23 מלך. xxviii. 20. xxix. 20. xxxii. 10 כלה, 14. xxxiv. 2. xxxv. 6. li. 6. Jer. iv. 13 *b*. xxv. 14. xxxi. 6,

9 *b*, 11, 25. Mic. i. 9, 12, 16. Zeph. i. 11. Zech. xi. 2. Ps. vi. 9 f. שָׁמַע. xxviii. 6. xxxi. 22 (prob.). lvi. 14. lix. 17[1]. Gen. xxx. 13 I am in luck, for the daughters אִשְּׁרוּנִי *are sure to call* me lucky!

Without כִּי, Is. xxi. 2, 14 (reason for 13). xxiii. 11. xxxiii. 14. xxxiv. 16. xxxv. 2. Zeph. ii. 2 like chaff *hath* the day (time of delay before לֵדֶת חָק) *passed by!* iii. 14 f. Lam. iv. 22.

(γ) But the pf. is also found (without כִּי) where, in a description of the future, it is desired to give variety to the scene, or to confer particular emphasis upon individual isolated traits in it; it may in this case appear in the midst of a series of imperfects, either ἀσυνδέτως, or connected with what precedes by the copulative, *provided that the* וְ *is separated from the verb* by one or more intervening words (if this be not the case, i. e. if the conjunction is *immediately* followed by the verb, the imperfect tense with וַ is of course employed: see below, § 83). For instance, without *waw*:—

Is. v. 28, 30 חִשֵּׁךְ. viii. 8. xiii. 10 *b*. xvi. 10. xvii. 11 *b* (if נָד be vb.). xxxiii. 5. xxxiv. 17 *a*. xix. 6 *b*, 7 *b*. xxiv. 14 *b*.

[1] In some of the passages from the Psalms we may not perhaps feel assured that the perfects are to be understood in this sense, as representing the certainty and confidence felt by the writers as regards the events they anticipate. It is undoubtedly *possible* that they may simply describe past facts or former experiences (like iv. 2. xxxi. 6 etc.) which the writer desires to refer to: so, for example, xxviii. 6. xxxi. 22. xxxvi. 13. But the 'perfect of certainty' is of such frequent and well-established occurrence, and at the same time so much more forcible and appropriate to the context than the more common-place 'perfect of experience,' that we need not scruple to interpret accordingly. Such sudden turns as those in vi. 9. xxviii. 6. xxx. 12, like the abrupt introduction of a new and dissimilar key in a piece of music, are most effective and emphatic.

xxv. 8 בִּלַּע he hath swallowed up death for ever! (contrast 7 ובלע). xxx. 19 עָנְךָ. 27 *b* (paints *a* with the certainty of a scene actually present). li.[1] 11 *b* יַשִּׂיגוּן נָסוּ. xlvii. 9. xlix. 17. Jer. xxv. 38. xxxi. 5 *b*. xlvii. 3. Hos. iv. 10 הִזְנוּ. ix. 7. Joel iv. 15. Zech. ix. 15 הָמוּ. Ps. xxxvii. 20. Job v. 19 f. in six troubles he will deliver thee, and in seven evil will not touch thee, in famine פָּדָךְ *he hath redeemed* thee from death!

With *waw*:—

Is. v. 27 *b* (a particular feature in their approach described as though *present to the eye*). xi. 8 הָדָה ... וְ. xviii. 5 הֵסִיר הַתָּו. xix. 8 *b*. xxv. 12. xxx. 32. Jer. xlviii. 33 *b*. Job v. 23. xxii. 28 *b*[2]. And similarly in descriptions of the present, Ps. vii. 13 (we see the bow *already drawn*). xi. 2 כוננו. Job xli. 20. Compare also Ps. xxxviii. 17. Job v. 11. xv. 31. xxi. 7, 34. xxviii. 25, cf. Ps. viii. 6: in all these passages there is a change of construction, the writer passing suddenly from an expression of *modality* to the statement of *a fact*.

15. Sometimes the perfect is used in order to give emphatic expression to a predicate which is immediately and necessarily involved in the subject of the verb[3]: thus

---

[1] In the parallel passage xxxv. 10 we have ישיגו ונסו: the change is curious and instructive; it appears to have arisen from the tail of the ו becoming accidentally shortened, or a copyist in doubt preferring the more usual construction, as LXX in xxxv. 10 as well as li. 11 have ἀπέδρα (which they are unlikely to have gone out of their way to choose, had they read ונסו), and no one can hesitate for a moment as to which is the most vigorous expression.

[2] I have been led to give a large number of examples of this use of the perfect, not only on account of its intrinsic importance, but also for a reason which will appear more fully in Chap. VIII.

[3] Cf. Rom. xiii. 8 ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον, τὸν νόμον πεπλήρωκε, and Winer, § 40, 4 *b*.

Prov. viii. 35 Qri, he that finds me *has* (in that very act) *found* life. xi. 7. xiv. 31. xvi. 26, 30. xvii. 5. xxi. 25, 29. xxii. 9. xxvii. 16. Job vi. 17: this resembles the use of the pf. in hypothetical sentences, on which see Chap. X.

16. (9) The perfect is used where we should employ by preference the pluperfect, i. e. in cases where it is desired to bring two actions in the past into a special relation with each other, and to indicate that the action described by the pluperfect was completed before the other took place. The function of the pluperfect is thus to throw two events into their proper perspective as regards each other: but the tense is to some extent a superfluous one—it is an elegance for which Hebrew possesses no distinct form, and which even in Greek, as is well known, both classical and Hellenistic, is constantly replaced by the simple aorist. Gen. ii. 2 God blessed the works which עשה *he had made*, LXX ἃ ἐποίησε; vi. 1. xix. 28 and behold the smoke עלה *had ascended* (had begun to ascend before Abraham looked). xx. 18 for *he had shut* up etc. xxviii. 11 בא. xxxi. 34 and Rachel *had* taken (before Laban entered into the tent, *v.* 33). xxxiv. 5. xxxvii. 7 קָמָה. xxxviii. 15. Deut. ix. 16. Judg. vi. 28. 1 Sam. xxviii. 20 for לא אכל he *had* not *eaten* bread. xxx. 12. 2 Sam. xviii. 18. 1 Kings i. 41 (they *had finished* eating when they heard). 2 Kings ix. 16. Is. vi. 6. Zech. xii. 10; after a conjunction like כַּאֲשֶׁר Gen. vii. 9. xviii. 33. xx. 13 etc.

Or, somewhat differently, when it may be wished to indicate explicitly that a given action was anterior to another action named immediately afterwards (not, as in the first case, named previously), Ps. xxx. 8 (where by rendering העמדתה by the plupf. we bring it into distinct

relief as *anterior* to the following הסתרת). Job xxxii. 4 but 'Elihu *had waited*, for they, Iyôb's friends, were older than he. xlii. 5 by hearing of the ear *had I heard* of thee, but now hath mine eye seen thee.

Obs. Such cases as these really present a fresh instance of the ambiguity noticed above, § 8, and originating in the use of the same tense to denote both the more immediate and the remoter past. Where the relation to each other, as regards time, of the events thus described is evident from the context, no alteration of tense need take place, and the plupf. is not required (e. g. Ps. civ. 6 f.): where, however, this is not the case, the plupf., which occupies the same position as regards the aorist, which the aorist occupies as regards the perfect, should be employed in English.

17. (10) Similarly, in the description of future events, it is often convenient in English to exhibit more distinctly the relation of two actions to one another by substituting for the Heb. perfect the future perfect, or 'paullo-post-futurum;' but this is by no means always obligatory, or even desirable. Lev. xiv. 48 נרפא. xix. 8 they that eat it shall bear their own sin, for (if any one eats it) he *will have profaned* what is holy to Yahweh. xx. 3 נתן, 17 גלה, 19 הערה, 20. 1 Sam. xiv. 10. xx. 22 if I say thus, go; for שִׁלַּחֲךָ Yahweh *will* (in that case) *have sent* thee away. Ezek. iii. 21 for (in that case) נִזְהָר (pf. *in pausa*) he *will have been warned* and THOU *wilt have delivered* thy soul. 1 Chron. xiv. 15 (in the parallel passage 2 Sam. v. 24 אָז is inserted). Gen. xlviii. 6 which thou *shalt have* begotten (not *mayest* beget, which would be תּוֹלִיד); after conjunctions, such as אַחַר, Lev. xiv. 43 אַחַר חִלֵּץ after *he has taken away* the stones. xxv. 48; עַד, 2 Kings vii. 3 עַד מֻתְנוּ till we *are dead*. Gen. xxviii. 15 until *I have done* etc. Ezek. xxxiv. 21. Mic. v. 2 עַד עֵת ילדה until the time when she *will have* borne; כִּי, Is.

xvi. 12 it shall come to pass, כִּי נִרְאָה when *it has appeared* (cum apparuerit) etc. 1 Chron. xvii. 11 when thy days מלאו *have been* fulfilled. Dan. xi. 36; אִם (= when), Is. iv. 4.

18. (11) The use of the perfect in both the protasis and apodosis of certain forms of hypothetical propositions will be illustrated below: see Chap. X. A few cases, however, may be noticed here in which the pf. is employed to denote events appertaining to past time, which *might have happened* but *did not happen*, which are therefore only for the moment conceived as having occurred, under conditions not actually realised. In Greek the existence of such conditions is (though not universally, Jelf, §§ 858 f. Winer, § 42, 2 *b* [1]) noted by ἄν in the apodosis: we observe therefore that the Heb. perfect corresponds not merely to the Greek aorist by itself, but to the Greek aorist with ἄν, that in other words it expresses the *contingent* as well as the *actual* occurrence of an event—the sense of the reader, or the tone in which the words are spoken, readily determining to which category the event is to be referred. So after כִּמְעַט Ps. lxxiii. 2. cxix. 87. Prov. v. 14; כַּאֲשֶׁר Zech. x. 6 *b*. Job x. 19 I should (then) be as though לא הייתי I had never been born.

19. (12) The perfect is used rather singularly in *questions*: 1. after עַד אָנָה or עַד מָתַי Ex. x. 3 until when מֵאַנְתָּ *wilt* thou *have* refused? xvi. 28. Num. xiv. 27 till when *am I to have* heard? Ps. lxxx. 5; and with impf. in the parallel clause Hab. i. 2. Prov. i. 22, cf. Jer. xxii. 23.

---

[1] And compare the use of the indicative in Latin, e. g. Hor. Carm. ii. 17. 27 Me truncus illapsus cerebro *Sustulerat* nisi Faunus ictu Dextra levasset.

And 2. to express astonishment at what appears to the speaker in the highest degree improbable :—

Gen. xviii. 12 הַיִתָה. Judg. ix. 9, 11, 13 *am I to have* lost my fatness וְהָלַכְתִּי and go? etc. 2 Kings xx. 9 הָלַךְ *iveritne*[1]? Num. xvii. 28 shall we ever have finished dying? Prov. xxiv. 28; and possibly Ps. lxxiii. 11. Job xxii. 13.

Gen. xxi. 7 who[2] *could have* said to Abraham? 1 Sam. xxvi. 9 מִי שָׁלַח ... וְנִקָּה who *is to have* put forth his hand ... and be guiltless? LXX τίς ἐποίσει (quite different from Lam. iii. 37. Job ix. 4 who ever hardened himself against him : וַיִּשְׁלָם and escaped whole? as is clear from both the sense of the passage and the difference in the *tense* of the second verb: see above, § 9, and Chap. VIII). Ps. xi. 3. lx. 11.

20. (13) Is there a *precative* perfect in Hebrew? in other words, does the perfect in Hebrew, as in Arabic, serve to give emphatic enunciation to a wish? The affirmative is maintained by Ewald, § 223 *b*, who cites Is. xxvi. 15. Ps. x. 16. xxxi. 6. lvii. 7. cxvi. 16. Job xxi. 16. xxii. 18. Lam. iii. 57–61 and the 'old form of speech' preserved Ps. xviii. 47; by Böttcher, §§ 939 *g*, 947 *g*, who, accepting out of Ewald's instances only Ps. cxvi. 16. Job xxi. 16. xxii. 18. Lam. iii. 57–61, adds to the list Is. xliii. 9. Mic. i. 10 Kt. Ps. iv. 2. vii. 7. xxii. 22. lxxi. 3. cxli. 6 f.[3]; and by Gesenius, § 124, 6 *c*. In any case, if the

---

[1] Where, accordingly, there is no need (with Hitzig on Ps. xi. 3) to change the punctuation and read הָלוֹךְ.

[2] Cf. Ephrem Syrus III. p. 59 if painters cannot paint the wind ܕܠܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܫܢܐ whose tongue *can have* described the Son of God? for which in str. 18 we have the impf. ܢܫܠܝ.

[3] Two other passages quoted Jer. l. 5. Joel iv. 11 do not in any case belong here, the verb in each being attached to ו.

usage exists, it is but an extension of the same manner of speech which has been already explained, § 14, viz. the perfect of certainty; the prominent position of the verb—in Arabic[1], to avoid misconstruction, it all but universally stands first in the sentence—aided by the tone of voice with which it is uttered being sufficient to invest the conviction or hope, which is all that the tense employed in itself expresses, with the character of a wish. But the fact is that the evidence for this signification of the pf. is so precarious, the passages adduced in proof of it admitting of a ready explanation by other means[2], that it will be safer to reject it altogether.

---

[1] For the Arabic usage see Ewald, *Gramm. Arab.* §§ 198, 710; Wright, *Arabic Gram.* ii. p. 3. Even the fact that in Hebrew the position of the verb is neglected ought to excite suspicion: in Arabic it is just the position which gives to the tense that interjectional force, upon which, in Ewald's words, its peculiar significance entirely depends.

[2] E. g. Ps. iv. 2. cxvi. 16 are quite naturally explained by § 9; vii. 7. lxxi. 3 resemble exactly ראיתה Ps. x. 14, cf. xxxviii. 10; Lam. iii. 57 ff. has been discussed already; Is. xxvi. 15 are words spoken from the standpoint of the future, and xliii. 9 the tenses are exactly similar to those in xli. 5. As regards Ps. xxii. 22 it is to be noticed that the words in question stand on the border-ground between the petition for help and the thanksgiving for its approach: it might almost be said that the poet began with the intention of saying ומקרני רמים תַּעֲנֵנִי, but that, as he wrote, the prospect of the deliverance burst upon him so brightly as to lead him to speak of it as an accomplished fact עניתני, which he then makes the key-note of the following verses 23–32. Compare further Hupfeld's note on Ps. iv. 2. Delitzsch would confine the use to such 'interjectional exclamations' as the one contained in the two verses from Job; but even there it is more than doubtful whether it is necessary or legitimate to have recourse to it.

CHAPTER III.

The Imperfect alone.

21. In marked antithesis to the tense we have just discussed, the imperfect in Hebrew, as in the other Semitic languages, indicates action as *incipient*, as preparing to take place, as developing. The imperfect does not express the *continuance* of an action: this function belongs to the participle—'let there be a firmament מַבְדִּיל *permanently and continuously dividing* between the waters:' the imperfect emphasizes the process introducing and leading to completion, and by thus seizing upon an action at the moment of its first appearance, and representing it under its most striking and impressive aspect (for it is just when a fresh object first appears upon a scene that it exhibits greater energy, and is, so to speak, more aggressive, than either while it simply continues or after it has been completed), it can present it in the liveliest manner possible—it can present it in *movement* rather than, like the pf., in a condition of rest. The action thus exhibited as *ready* or *about to take place* may belong to the past, the present, or the future; but an event ready and so capable of taking place would be likely and liable to occur more than once; we thus find the imperfect employed to denote *reiterated* actions—'a mist יַעֲלֶה *used to go up*' (upon repeated occasions; but וְנָהָר יֹצֵא 'and a river *was* (unin-

termittently) *proceeding* out of the garden')[1]. Strictly יעלה expresses only a *single* event as beginning or ready to take place; but an action of which this may be predicated is in the nature of things likely to happen more frequently, and thus the additional connotation of 'recurrency' would be speedily superinduced upon the more limited original signification of the imperfect[2].

22. The same form is further employed to describe events belonging to the *future;* for the future is emphatically τὸ μέλλον, and this is just the attribute specially expressed by the imperfect. The idea of reiteration is not prominent in this case, because the occurrence of the event spoken of is by itself sufficient to occupy and satisfy the mind, which does not look beyond to reflect whether it is likely to happen more than once: on the other hand, when a *past* event is described by the impf. the attention is at once arrested by the peculiarities of the tense—original and derived—which are *not* explained if a *single* action alone be assumed[3]. Reiteration in the future

[1] Cf. the English 'apt,' properly = fitted, suited, adapted, but also used in the phrase '*to be apt* to do so and so,' in a frequentative signification = '*to be liable, accustomed,* or *used* to do so and so:' we here see how an expression indicating simply *readiness* or *capacity* may so extend its original connotation as to acquire in addition the power of connoting *recurrence.*

[2] Nor will this circumstance occasion any greater room for doubt or obscurity than the well-known fact that such a word as רֶכֶב, for instance, may be used in a double sense, as a collective as well as an individual noun.

[3] This may be otherwise stated as follows:—Where the future is spoken of, the force of the imperfect is exhausted by the idea of futurity which it conveys: where the past is spoken of, its force is not exhausted, and therefore its presence not accounted for, if it connote the *mere* occurrence of an event. The latter is a function

must be inferred from the nature of the idea expressed by the verb, not from the grammatical form which it assumes; nor is the ambiguity any greater than in the case of the perfect, which, as we saw above, might be used indiscriminately, either to describe an action completed and done with, or to describe one of which the results lasted up to the moment at which the sentence was uttered.

23. An idea, however, like that of *incipiency*, *beginning*, or *going to be* is almost indefinitely elastic: on the one hand, that which is in the process of coming to pass is also that which is *destined* or *must* come to pass (τὸ μέλλον); on the other hand, it is also that which *can* or *may* come to pass. If the subject of the verb be also the speaker, i. e. if the verb be in the first person, that which is about to come to pass will be commonly that which he himself *desires* or *wishes* to come to pass; if, however, the verb be in the second or third person, it naturally expresses the wishes of the speaker *as regards some one else*, and so conveys a more or less emphatic *permission* which imperceptibly passes, especially in negative sentences, into a *command*. אֶרְאֶה Deut. xxxii. 20 *I will* or *am about to look*, I should like to look; תֹּאכֵל *thou mayest eat* Gen. ii. 16, but, in the injunctions for the passover, Ex. xii. 11 *ye are to* or *shall* eat it; לֹא תֹאכֵל Gen. ii. 17 *thou mayest*, *shalt*, or *must*, not eat it; יִהְיֶה *it is about to be*, or, if

performed by the pf.: the imperfect (unless its appearance depends upon nothing but chance) must have been chosen in order to suggest in addition some feature *accompanying* the occurrence, in other words to connote and specify the mode or manner of occurrence. And this feature may be either that of incipiency, of reiteration, or, as we shall immediately see, of modality.

spoken by a person with power to bring it about, *it shall be*, לֹא יִהְיֶה *it is not to be.*

24. But again, since the imperfect expresses an action not as *done* but only as *doing*, as possessing consequently an element of uncertainty and indeterminateness, not already fixed and defined but capable of assuming any form, or taking any direction which may be impressed upon it from without, it is used after conjunctions such as לְמַעַן, בַּעֲבוּר, פֶּן, precisely as in Latin the corresponding terms are followed not by the indicative, the mood of certainty, but by the subjunctive, the mood of contingency. And, in accordance with the principle stated above that the Hebrew 'tenses' do not in themselves specify the period of time within which a given action must have happened, any of the *nuances* just assigned to the imperfect will retain their force in the past as well as in the present, the same tense is competent to connote both *is to* and *was to*, *may* and *might*, *can* and *could*, *will* and *would*, *shall* and *should*, in all the varied positions and shades of meaning which these auxiliaries may assume.

25. The imperfect, then, characterizes in general action as *incipient* or *potential;* but this potentiality may be expressed either (1) as a substantive and independent fact, i.e. the tense may appear as *indicative;* or (2) as regulated by the will of a personal agent, i. e. the tense may appear as *voluntative* (optative); or (3) as determined by some antecedent event, i. e. the tense may appear as *subjunctive*[1].

[1] It will be observed that this tripartite division is not maintained in what follows. The fact is that Hebrew, unlike Arabic, possesses no distinctive terminations to mark the subjunctive mood: although therefore the imperfect fulfils the functions which elsewhere

26. We may now proceed to arrange the various senses in which the imperfect is employed.

In the description of past occurrences it is used in two different ways, as explained above: 1. to represent an event at the moment of its genesis, and so, by seizing upon it while in movement rather than while at rest, to picture it with peculiar vividness to the mental eye; in this case it may sometimes be rendered in English by the '*historical present*,' the effect of which is similarly to present in strong relief and with especial liveliness the features of a scene described by its aid; and 2. as a frequentative, to suggest the reiteration of the event spoken of. In which of these senses it is on each occasion to be understood is left to the intelligence of the reader to determine; and this will not generally lead him astray. In cases where any doubt remains, it may be inferred either that the decision is immaterial, or else that the requisite data for forming one no longer exist as they must have done when the passage was written—a consideration which will of course account for much of the obscurity that rests upon the interpretation of ancient documents in all languages.

27. (1) This usage is naturally most frequent in a poetical or elevated style: but in prose equally the imperfect, if describing a single action and so not capable of explanation as a frequentative, operates by bringing into prominence the process introducing it and preliminary to its complete execution (as in Greek καταδύετο,

---

belong to a subjunctive, distinguishable as such, it is sufficient to notice the fact generally, without pausing to enquire upon each occasion whether the tense is indicative or subjunctive.

began to sink); it will then be best rendered by *proceeded, began, went on to* . . .

(*a*) First of all, in the language of poetry or prophecy; Ex. xv. 5 the depths יְכַסִּימוּ *covered them!* (but here, as in almost all the other passages, it is impossible in English to reproduce the force and fire of the original), 6, 7, 15. Num. xxiii. 7 and he took up his parable and said, From Aram Balaq יַנְחֵנִי *bringeth me!* Deut. xxxii. 10 יִמְצָאֵהוּ he *found* him (or *findeth* him) in a desert land! (but in 10 *b*, 12, 14, 16, 17 the impf. is more probably frequentative), 18 תֶּשִׁי thou *begannest to forget* the rock that had borne thee (the act realised with peculiar emphasis). Judg. ii. 1 *I brought you up* out of Egypt etc. (placing in bright relief before the people's minds the event they had apparently lost sight of). v. 26, 29 (vivid pictures of Ja'el *stretching out* her hand, and the princesses in the act of *answering*). Is. xliii. 17. xlv. 4 אֲכַנְּךָ, 5. li. 2 Sarah תְּחוֹלֵלְכֶם who *bare* you. lxiii. 14 ת׳. Jon. ii. 6. Hab. iii. 3, 7. Job iii. 3 perish the day אִוָּלֶד בּוֹ I *was being* born in! 11 why did I not *go on to* die (at once die) from the womb? iv. 12, 15. x. 10 f. xv. 7. xxxviii. 9. Ps. vii. 16 and falleth into the pit יִפְעָל: *he is* or *was making*[1]. xviii. 7, 21. xxx. 9? xxxii. 5. lxxx. 9 *a*. cv. 44 (cf. Deut. ii. 12). cxvi. 3 f., 6. Lam. iii. 8 when I *would fain* cry.

(*β*) In prose this use of the impf. is much rarer, except after אָז or טֶרֶם, which introduce or point to an ensuing event, and are accordingly constantly followed by this

[1] Not, as Auth. Version, *made;* the impf. shews that the writer thought of the process as not completed—while *engaged upon carrying out* his design, the destruction overtakes him. Cf. ἐσύλα Il. xvii. 60, where in the tense we almost see the sequel foreshadowed.

tense. Thus, for example, after אָז Ex. xv. 1 אָז יָשִׁיר *then sang* Moses (proceeded, began to sing). Deut. iv. 41. Josh. viii. 30. x. 12. xxii. 1. Ps. lxix. 5. cxxvi. 2 etc.; after טֶרֶם or בְּטֶרֶם all but universally, Gen. ii. 5. xix. 4. xxiv. 45. 1 Sam. iii. 3, 7 *b* etc.[1] The impf. is likewise found (in past time as well as future) after עַד or עַד אֲשֶׁר; but here the sense of indefiniteness inherent in this conjunction being at times more perceptibly felt was probably to some extent the cause why the impf. should then have been selected by the writers in preference to the pf. Thus Josh. x. 13 עַד יִקֹּם. Jon. iv. 5. Ps. lxxiii. 17. Qoh. ii. 3. 2 Chron. xxix. 34.

(γ) Compare further the imperfect after לְעֵת Deut. xxxii. 35, or בְּעֵת Job vi. 17. 2 Chron. xxiv. 11 (where, however, as the sequel shews, the impf. is really frequentative); also Gen. ii. 10 מִשָּׁם יִפָּרֵד from there it *began to divide.* xxxvii. 7 and behold *they began to* move round (Joseph represents the sheaves as being in *motion;* conceive סָבִיב in place of ת׳, and how lifeless the image becomes!). xlviii. 17[2]. Ex. viii. 20. 2 Sam. xv. 37 יָבוֹא (almost *started for;* the actual entry is recorded later, xvi. 15 בָּא). xxiii. 10. 1 Kings vii. 8. xx. 33. xxi. 6. 2 Kings viii. 29

---

[1] אז is, however, also frequently found with the pf., Gen. iv. 26. Ex. iv. 26. xv. 15. 1 Kings xxii. 50 etc.: but טרם only very rarely, Gen. xxiv. 15 (contrast *v.* 45 above). 1 Sam. iii. 7 *a* (cf. *b*); and בטרם Ps. xc. 2. Prov. viii. 25.

[2] It is difficult to see what is intended here by the impf. יָשִׁית: it certainly cannot mean the same as שָׁת *had placed;* it seems that either the writer has abandoned the strict chronological order (cf. Judg. ii. 6), and having described what was his main point, viz. the blessing of Joseph, now proceeds to mention an incident which actually took place before it (he saw that he *was on the point of*

(=ix. 15: but 2 Chron. xxii. 6 the pf.). Jer. lii. 7. Ezra ix. 4. 2 Chron. xxv. 14.

28. But the impf. is also used in the same way of a single action in the *present* time, in order to express it with force, Gen. xxxvii. 15. Num. xxiv. 17 אֶרְאֶנּוּ *I see* him, but not now! 1 Sam. xxi. 15 תִּרְאוּ. Jer. vi. 4 the day *hath turned* (pf.), and the shadows of evening יִנְטוּ *are beginning to* lengthen. Hos. i. 2 *b* (or freq. *plays* the whore). Hab. iii. 9, 12. Job iv. 5. vi. 16, 17. xxxiii. 12 *a*. Ps. ii. 2, 4. lix. 9. xvii. 12 he is like a lion יִכְסוֹף *eager* for prey (at the moment when he is eager).

It is further often found in the phrase מֵאַיִן תָּבֹא (תָּבוֹא) (or אֵימָה) *whence art thou coming?* although not to the exclusion of the pf. (בָּאתָם) בָּאתָ, which is, however, considerably more rare: in the former case the action is regarded as on the road to completion; in the latter, as actually completed. For example, Josh. ix. 8. Judg. xvii. 9. xix. 17. 2 Sam. i. 3 etc.; and, on the other hand, Gen. xvi. 8. xlii. 7.

29. More frequent is the use of the impf. as equivalent to the *future*—a use which is clearly only an extension of that noted in § 28: there the action is conceived to be taking place (but not completed) as the words are uttered; here it has not yet begun to take place at all, but its beginning to do so is contemplated in the future—nearer or more remote, as the context and sense demand.

---

placing . . .), or that Joseph was only now, after his own blessing, rising from his prostrate position, *v.* 12, and able to see how his father's hands were placed. From his point of view, therefore, a new event dawning upon his consciousness is described, and hence the impf. tense. This latter view is Böttcher's, ii. 163[5].

Numerous instances may readily be found, e.g. Gen. xlix. 1. Ex. vi. 1. ix. 5 etc.[1]

If the future is close at hand, the verb may be rendered almost indifferently by a pres. or fut.: 1 Kings i. 42 תְּבַשֵּׂר annunciaturus es, *announcest* or *wilt announce*, art on the point of announcing. Ps. ii. 2. lix. 9 (quoted in § 28).

30. (2) So much for the impf. as denoting a single act. By what steps it in addition assumes a frequentative signification has been explained above: it only remains to give instances of its use.

(*a*) In past time: Gen. vi. 4 יָבֹאוּ. xxx. 38. xxxi. 39 I אֲחַטֶּנּוּ *used to bear* the loss of it. l. 3. Ex. i. 12. xix. 19 (*kept* speaking, *kept* answering). xl. 36, 38 (*used* to be). Num. ix. 16–23 *a* (describing what the Israelites *used constantly* to do in the desert: *v.* 23 *b* the whole is summed up, and stated generally as a single fact, in the pf. שמרו). Josh. xxiii. 10 (*would* often pursue). Judg. ii. 18 (*used to* or *would* repent). vi. 4 (*kept* coming up) etc. 1 Sam. ii. 22. xviii. 5. xxi. 12 הֲלוֹא זֶה יַעֲנוּ is not this he of whom *they kept singing?* (on the well-known occasion

---

[1] In the *first* pers. *I shall*, Gen. xv. 8. Judg. xiii. 22. xv. 18. Is. xxxviii. 11. Jer. iv. 21 *a*. Job xvii. 10: but most usually *I will*, 1 Kings ii. 30. Ruth i. 17; Gen. vi. 7. viii. 21. xii. 2 etc. Ps. xii. 6. xxii. 26 etc. *I shall* is the pure and simple future—German *ich soll*, *I am to* or *must;* the speaker's own inclinations are dormant, and he regards himself as the passive creature of circumstances: *I will*, on the contrary, is exclusively the exponent of a purpose or volition, and the *personal* interest of the speaker makes itself strongly felt. We may, if we please, substitute *I shall* for the more expressive *I will*, without materially altering the sense: the opposite change can, of course, be never made with impunity.

xviii. 6, 7). 1 Kings iii. 4. vi. 8. vii. 26 יָכִיל (*used to* or *would* contain), 38. x. 5, 16 f. Is. i. 21. vi. 2. vii. 23 (where the freq. and the fut. senses of the impf. meet in a single verse) etc. Ps. xlii. 5. lv. 15. xcv. 10. xcix. 6 f. (with 7 comp. Num. ix. 23). cvi. 43, cf. Neh. ix. 27. Job iv. 3 f. xxix. 3, 9, 12 f., 16 f. xxxii. 11 f. etc. 1 Chron. xi. 8.

31. The passages quoted will suffice amply to shew that when occurring in the historical books the impf. *always* expresses a deal more than the mere pf.: how far more picturesque, for example, is the scene Judg. vi. 4 rendered by the choice of יַעֲלֶה than it would have been had the writer simply used the pf. עָלָה! No more, then, need be said on the necessity of discriminating the impf. from the pf.; but a few words must be added to guard against the error of confusing it with the participle.

The only species of continued action to which the impf. can give expression is the introductory process which may culminate in the finished act, §§ 27 γ, 28; and even here its use is limited: *mere* continuance in the sense of duration *without progress* is never connoted by the impf.; wherever this seems to be the case, closer examination will shew that the apparently continuous action is not really indivisible, but consists of a number of separate acts which, following one another in rapid succession, present the appearance of perfect continuity, and may be actually treated as such by language. But the fact that the same series of events may be treated under two aspects must not lead us to confuse the form which gives expression to the one with the form that gives expression to the other. The participle is the form which indicates continued action. 'Forty years long *was I grieved* with this generation:' the English is ambiguous;

it may correspond either to an original participle or to an original impf. As a fact it corresponds to the latter: 'forty years long אָקוּט *was I grieved*,' i. e. upon repeated occasions, not of necessity continuously. Similarly, מֹשֶׁה יְדַבֵּר is 'Moses *kept speaking*:' 'Moses *was speaking*' would be expressed by the part. מֹשֶׁה מְדַבֵּר (see 1 Kings i. 25, 42 etc.). Thus while the impf. multiplies an action, the participle prolongs it. Sometimes the two forms are found in juxtaposition, as Ps. xcix. 6; but however closely they may seem to resemble each other in meaning, and even where they would admit of an interchange without material alteration or detriment to the sense, it must not be forgotten that they are still quite different, and that each seizes upon and brings into view a distinct phase of action.

The difference between the impf. and the part. is most clearly displayed in passages like Gen. xxix. 2. 1 Sam. ii. 13 f. 1 Kings x. 22. Is. vi. 2 (*were standing* at the period of the vision—*used to* cover, fly: even the sense alone will scarcely allow עמדים and יעופף to be simultaneous). At other times, on the contrary, the separate units of which the series actually consists are lost from sight and replaced by a continuous line[1]: e. g. Gen. xxxix. 6 אוכל (contrast 2 Sam. xii. 3 תאכל), 23 (contr. Ps. i. 3. 1 Sam. xiv. 47). 1 Kings xvii. 6 מביאים (but also ישתה). 2 Kings iv. 5. Ps. xxxvii. 12, 21, 26.

---

[1] Accordingly the participle, filling up the intervals which the impf. leaves open, is adapted to magnify or exaggerate any circumstance: cf. 1 Kings x. 24 f. Ex. xviii. 14 (where observe how in this way Jethro represents Moses as being more fully and continuously occupied than the latter in his reply is willing to admit). Esth. iii. 2 and the reversal of the picture in viii. 17 *b*. ix. 3.

32. (β) In present time. It may be well here, in order to avoid confusion, to remind ourselves of an ambiguity existing in the English present tense. The present tense in English, besides declaring single and isolated facts, is constantly used to express general truths, to state facts which need not necessarily take place at the moment at which the assertion is being made, but which either *may* occur at *any* time or do *actually* occur periodically: in other words, the present tense appears as a *frequentative:* it *multiplies* an action, and distributes it over an indefinite number of potential or actual realisations. And, in fact, this use of the present in English to denote acts which may be or are repeated, is more common than any other. But it is just this frequentative or distributive force which the Hebrew impf. possesses, asserting, as it does, facts which either *may be* realised at any time, or *are* realised repeatedly. Our present, therefore, and the Hebrew impf. agree in a remarkable manner in being able to specify actions which though not in themselves appertaining to any particular period of time whatever, *may* nevertheless make their appearance at any or every moment. This distinction between the two senses of our present tense it is important here to keep in mind: because the Hebrew impf., while but rarely found in one sense, is extremely common in the other. When, therefore, it is said that this tense corresponds to the English 'present,' it is necessary to have a clear and precise view of what this statement really means.

33. The imperfect, then, is found—

(*a*) Asserting facts of definite occurrence: Ex. xiii. 15 אֶפְדֶּה *I redeem* (am in the habit of redeeming). xviii. 15 the people יָבֹא *cometh* to me (keep coming). Gen. xxii. 14

therefore יֹאמַר *it is said.* 1 Sam. ix. 6. 2 Sam. v. 8. Judg. xiv. 10 for so young men *are accustomed to do.* 2 Sam. xiv. 15 for *they fear* me. Is. i. 13. iii. 16 *b.* xiv. 8 *doth not come up* (never cometh up, where notice how *never* distributes the verb). xliv. 17. Jer. ix. 3. xx. 8. Hos. iv. 12 f. Ps. xi. 2. xxiii. 2 f. xxxv. 11 f. xxxvi. 5. lxxi. 17 till now *do* I *keep declaring* thy wonders. xciv. 4–6. cxix. 23. Job xix. 22 etc.

(*b*) Asserting facts, which are not conceived as definitely occurring within stated or implied limits of time, but as liable to occur at any period that may be chosen: e. g. in the enunciation of general maxims or truths, Ps. i. 2 יְהֻגֶּה, 3 which *giveth* (is always ready to give, in the habit of giving) its fruit in due season, and its leaf *doth* not *fade*, and all that *he doeth* he *maketh to prosper*, 4 *driveth away*, 5 *do not stand* or *endure* (are not in the habit of gaining their cause), 6 *perisheth* ('will' perish, i.e. either as a pure future, however sure it may seem to appear for a time, it will in the end perish; or as a frequentative, is apt to perish,—wherever you see a ד׳ ר׳ you always see that it perishes). Ex. xxxiii. 11 as a man יְדַבֵּר *speaketh* with his neighbour. 1 Sam. ix. 6. xvi. 7 יִרְאֶה. Is. lv. 10 יֵרֵד. Jer. xiii. 11. Hos. iv. 11. Ps. xviii. 26–28. xxxviii. 14. xxxix. 7. xli. 8. lxxxix. 44. xci. 5 f. ci. 5. civ. 13, 23, 26. cxix. 2. Prov. x. 3, 10. xiv. 3. xv. 12 *will* not go ('will' being frequentative). xxvi. 14 the door *turns* upon its hinge, and a sluggard upon his bed. Job xiv. 10.

34. This form of the verb, expressing as it does a general truth, is sometimes found attached to a substantive, the relative being omitted, to denote a general attribute belonging to it: under these circumstances it almost degenerates into an adjective. Thus Gen. xlix. 27

Benjamin is זְאֵב יִטְרָף a *ravening* wolf (lit. a wolf (that) ravens). Is. li. 12 אֱנוֹשׁ יָמוּת *mortal* man. lv. 13 an *indestructible* sign. lxii. 1 כלפיד יבער. Ps. lxxviii. 6. Hos. iv. 14 a people לֹא יָבִין without understanding. Or it is attached to another verb, so as to qualify it almost in the manner of an adverb, Is. xxx. 14 bruising לֹא יַחְמֹל *unsparingly*[1]. lxiv. 2. Ps. xvii. 3 *without finding* (qualifying צ׳: the verse may, however, be taken otherwise). Job viii. 12.

But this usage will be found further illustrated in Appendix I.

35. It appears from what has been said that both the pf. and the impf. alike, though upon different grounds, may be employed to designate those permanent relations which constitute on the one hand personal habits or attributes, on the other general truths. A permanent relation of this sort may, firstly, be viewed as a completed whole, and, as such, be denoted by the pf.; but inasmuch as a state or condition most commonly declares itself by a succession of acts—more or less numerous, as the case may be—its existence may, at the same time, with equal propriety, be indicated by the impf. as well. It is accordingly at once intelligible upon what principle we frequently find the two tenses alternating—for example in the two members of a verse—when used in this way; the interchange being naturally encouraged by the pleasing variety produced by its adoption. Sometimes the change of tense may be retained in English: at other times it will be simpler and less pedantic—a minor grammatical

---

[1] If with Baer we read here נָתוּת, לא יחמל will then qualify ושברה.

distinction, unless absolutely indispensable for the sense, must be given up if its preservation involve stiffness or sound unnatural—to render both tenses by what is here, in our language, the idiomatic equivalent of both, viz. the present. Yet, however we translate, it must not be forgotten that a difference still exists in the words of the original, and that each tense possesses a propriety the force of which can be distinctly felt, even where it cannot be reproduced; it is simply the imperfection, in this respect, of our own language, its deficiency in delicacy that necessitates our obliterating the lights and shades which an otherwise constructed instrument is capable of expressing.

Thus Is. v. 12. xxvi. 9. xxxiii. 7. xliv. 12–18. Hos. vii. 1 *b*. Joel ii. 3 *a*, 6. Hab. iii. 3. Ps. ii. 1 f. v. 6 (*cannot stand . . . thou hatest*). vi. 7 (the pf., as 8, expressing his completed state of exhaustion; the impff. his repeated acts). vii. 13 f. (he *hath* prepared instruments of death: his arrows he *maketh* (or *is making*) flaming!). xi. 5, 7 the upright *behold* his face. xvi. 9 יִשְׁכֹּן (parallel to שָׁכַן) *dwelleth* or *can dwell*. xxii. 16. xxiii. 5. xxvi. 4, 5. xxxviii. 12. lv. 5. lxii. 5. lxiv. 4 f. lxv. 14. lxxiii. 5–9, 27. lxxiv. 1. lxxxiv. 3. xciii. 3. cii. 15. cix. 3 f. Prov. iv. 17. xii. 12. xxviii. 1. Job xi. 20. xii. 20 f. xiv. 18 f. xv. 9. xxxix. 29 etc.[1]

36. It will now, moreover, be apparent how the impf., especially if suddenly introduced ἀσυνδέτως, may be effectively employed by prophets and poets in the description of a scene or series of events not merely to vary the style

[1] Cf. also Lev. xi. 4–6, where we have the part., impf., and pf. in succession employed, from different points of view, to describe the same attribute.

of narrative, but to throw into what would otherwise have been a motionless picture the animation and vigour of life. Thus, for example, Is. ii. 8 and the land is filled with idols, to the work of their own hands יִשְׁתַּחֲווּ *they bow down!* iii. 16 *b* (designed to make the reader realise forcibly the image presented by וְתַלְכְנָה). v. 15 *b* (to suppose this to be a pure future is to assume too abrupt a transition from the point of view of the preceding and following verbs. The prophet is rather describing a scene he sees in vision, in the language of history, and confers a passing emphasis upon a particular feature). ix. 10 and his enemies *he armeth*, 16, 17, 18 *b*, 19 *b* the people has become as fuel for fire, none *spareth* (or *is sparing*) his brother! x. 4, 28. xiv. 10 (after the pff. 9). xv. 3, 4 *b*. xxiv. 9. xxvi. 5 f. etc.

37. The impf., as we saw above, expresses not merely simple futurity (I shall, thou wilt, he will), but is equivalent further to the same auxiliaries in their other and more emphatic capacity as the exponents of volition (I will, thou shalt, he shall). We saw further that it possesses a potential and concessive force, corresponding to *can* and *may*. In past time, or in oratio obliqua, these auxiliaries naturally suffer in English a change of tense, becoming respectively *should*, *would*, *could*, and *might*. Some instances of the impf. occurring with these significations will now be given: it is noticeable, however, that frequently we are by no means restricted to a single equivalent in translating[1].

[1] The senses which follow I have arranged simply with reference to the auxiliaries as they are met with in English, without stopping to enquire, except incidentally, how far any of the latter may bear equivocal meanings. It would have been interesting to examine

(*a*) Gen. xli. 15 תִּשְׁמַע thou *canst* understand a dream (or simply *dost* understand; and similarly in the other passages). Ex. iv. 14. Num. xxxv. 33 יְכַפֶּר. 2 Kings vi. 12 Elijah *can* tell. Ezek. xxviii. 9 *canst* thou say I am a god? 2 Chron. vi. 18. Job iv. 19 moths which people *can crush* (or *are in the habit of* crushing, or *may* crush). Ps. v. 8[1]. xviii. 30. Prov. xx. 9. Job xxviii. 15.

(*β*) 1 Kings viii. 5 oxen לֹא־יִסָּפְרוּ that *could* not be counted. Hos. ii. 1 (=innumerable). Jer. xxiv. 2 figs that *could* not be eaten (=uneatable). Ezek. xx. 25 statutes they *could* not live in. 1 Kings xviii. 10 that לֹא־יִמְצָאֲכָה he *could* not find thee (not לֹא־מְצָאָךְ *had not found thee*). Job xxxviii. 31 couldst thou bind? xxxix. 19 f.

38. (*a*) Gen. ii. 16 ye *may* eat. xlii. 37 thou *mayest* (or *shalt*) kill my two sons, if etc. Ex. v. 11. Num. xxxv. 28 the slayer *may* return. Lev. xix. 17. Deut. v. 20 we see God *may* speak with a man, and he (yet) live. xii. 20 תֹּאכַל. Judg. xvi. 6 (or *canst* be bound). Is. xl. 30 *may* weary. xlix. 15 *b* (cf. Ps. xci. 7). Ps. xxx. 6. Job xiv. 21. xxi. 3 *b*.

Sometimes in an ironical sense: Ps. xii. 9. xiv. 6 תָּבִישׁוּ ye *may* put to shame (if ye like! it matters not). xlvi. 4 (prob.). xci. 13. cix. 28 *they* may curse, but do *thou* bless!

---

them somewhat more minutely, comparing them with the corresponding verbs in German, and tracing some of the variations of meaning they have undergone in our own language: but this would have led us too far; and I hope enough has been said to place the Hebrew usage beyond the possible reach of confusion or mistake.

[1] Cf. Delitzsch: 'die Futt. *v.* 8 besagen was er thun darf und thun wird: durch die Grösse göttlicher Gnade *hat er Zugang* zum Heiligthum.'

In the preceding instances the impf. is equivalent to *may* in its permissive or concessive capacity; in those which follow it corresponds to *may* as a term indicating indefiniteness. In the former case, therefore, the tense expresses an independent idea (*licet*, ἔξεστιν), and is consequently indicative; in the latter, on the contrary, it is employed to convey the notion of dependency, and accordingly assumes the position and force of a true subjunctive.

Ex. viii. 23 we will sacrifice כַּאֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר as he *may* command us (see x. 26). ix. 19. LXX ὅσα ἐὰν εὑρεθῇ. 2 Kings xii. 5. Prov. iv. 19.

(β) And in past time: Ex. xxxiv. 34 whatever he *might* be commanded[1]. Deut. iv. 42 the murderer who *might* slay his neighbour. Josh. ix. 27 which he *might* choose. Judg. xvii. 8. 1 Sam. xxiii. 13[2]. 2 Sam. xv. 6 יָבֹאוּ (or *used to come*). 1 Kings v. 8 יהיה. 2 Chron. ii. 11 (qui aedificaret). Ezek. i. 12 οὗ ἂν ἦν.

39. (*a*) Expressing a command: Ex. xxi. 12 מוֹת יוּמָת: he *shall* be put to death, 14, 15 etc. Num. xv. 14 as ye do, כֵּן יַעֲשֶׂה so *shall* he do. xxxvi. 7, 9 יִדְבָּקוּ etc., and with especial frequency in negative sentences (which indeed can be expressed in no other way). Ex. xx. 3–17 etc. etc.

With a slightly different *nuance:* Ex. xxii. 26 in what (else) יִשְׁכָּב *is* he *to* lie? Num. xxiii. 8 how אֶקֹּב *shall* I (or *can I, am I to*) curse? 2 Kings xx. 9 or יָשׁוּב *shall* it return ten degrees? and in dependent sentences: Ex. iii. 3. x. 26 we do not know מַה־נַּעֲבֹד how we shall

---

[1] Or יִצָּוֶה may be merely freq., like the preceding יָסִיר.

[2] Cf. similar phrases 2 Sam. xv. 20. 2 Kings viii. 1. Ex. iv. 13. Ezek. xii. 25. Hos. ix. 14.

(or *are to*) serve Yahweh, till etc. xviii. 20 the way they *shall* (or *must*) walk in.

(β) And in the past, or oratio obliqua:—

Num. xv. 34 it had not been declared מַה־יֵּעָשֶׂה what *should* (or *was to*) be done to him. Neh. xiii. 22 I told them that they *must* (were to) cleanse themselves. 2 Kings xvii. 28 he taught them how they *should* (*ought to, had to, were to*) fear Yahweh. Esth. ii. 10. Dan. i. 5.

Also Gen. xxxiv. 31. xliii. 7 הֲיָדוֹעַ נֵדַע *were* we possibly *to* know? (or *could* we know?) Judg. v. 8 *was* there *to* be seen? (or *could* there be seen?=*was* there *ever* seen?) 2 Sam. iii. 33 *was* Abner *to* die as a fool dieth? (יָמוּת, quite different from הֲמֵת *did he die?*) 1 Kings vii. 7 (=οὗ ἔμελλε κρίνειν). 2 Kings xiii. 14 the illness which he *was to* die of. iii. 27 he took his firstborn ὃς ἔμελλε βασιλεύειν; and as equivalent to *should* in the sense of *ought*, Gen. xxxiv. 7 and so it *should not* or *ought not* to be done. 2 Sam. xiii. 12.

(γ) Moreover, in questions after לָמָּה (or לָמָה), מָדוּעַ, אֵיךְ, instead of the outspoken, categorical pf., the impf. as more conciliatory, more adapted to a tone of entreaty or deprecation, is often preferred[1]: thus Ex. ii. 13 why תַּכֶּה *shouldest* thou smite thy neighbour? v. 15. xxxii. 11 f. 1 Sam. xxi. 15. Ps. xi. 1. Job iii. 20[2].

Further, Ex. iii. 11 qualis sum כִּי אֵלֵךְ *ut* adeam? xvi. 7. 2 Kings viii. 13 what is thy servant, the dog

---

[1] And of course when the speaker desires to avert or deprecate an action which is only impending, or not finally completed, as Num. xxvii. 4. 1 Sam. xix. 5. 2 Sam. xvi. 9; cf. also Gen. xliv. 34. Ps. cxxxvii. 1 how *shall* (or *can*) we sing? Jer. xlvii. 7. 1 Sam. xx. 2 why *should* he hide? Contrast the pf. Gen. xxvi. 9. 2 Sam. i. 14.

[2] Contrast the different language, 2 Sam. xvi. 10. 1 Kings i. 6.

(2 Sam. ix. 8), that he *should* do this great thing? Hos. i. 6. Ps. viii. 5 and in the parody Job vii. 17. Likewise after כִּי (or אֲשֶׁר), in cases where the whole phrase is equivalent to an infinitive, 2 Sam. xviii. 3 it is good כִּי־תִהְיֶה־לָּנוּ *that thou shouldest be* (ready) to help us from the city. Job x. 3, 9. Qoh. v. 4. Neh. ii. 5 (with these compare Gen. ii. 18. xxix. 19. Ex. xiv. 12. Judg. xviii. 19 is it good, הֱיוֹתְךָ כֹהֵן *thy being* a priest?)

40. Is. xxi. 12 if ye *would* (or *are going to*) enquire, enquire! Gen. ii. 19. xliii. 7, 25 they heard they *would* (or *were to*) eat there. Ex. ii. 4. Num. xxiv. 11 I said *I would* bless thee. 1 Sam. xxii. 22. 2 Sam. i. 10 יחיה. Is. xlviii. 8. Jer. li. 60. Jon. iv. 5. Qoh. ii. 14.

For the impf., as signifying *would* in the apodosis, and generally for its use in hypothetical propositions, see Chap. X.

41. Lastly, the imperfect is used after *final* conjunctions, as לְמַעַן, בַּעֲבוּר *in order that*, פֶּן *lest;* further, after אוּלַי *perhaps*, and other similar words. It is, however, unnecessary to give instances here, as plenty will be found below, Chap. VIII (where, in addition, the impf. is followed by another verb).

Obs. Two or three times פן is found with a perfect, 2 Sam. xx. 6. 2 Kings ii. 16 (followed by ·וַ)[1]; in the latter passage the result feared is conceived as possibly *having* taken place (exactly as Thuk. iii. 53 νῦν δὲ φοβούμεθα μὴ ἀμφοτέραν ἅμα ἡμαρτήκαμεν), and so the use of the pf. may be justified. In the former, such an explanation appears unnatural and strained, and it is better to correct יִמְצָא[2].

---

[1] Cf. also x. 23.

[2] Besides, והציל עיננו is clearly some *future* contingency, intimately affecting himself, which David dreads. Now, this being the case, והציל, as we shall see Chap. VIII, *could not* be preceded by a pf.

Josh. iv. 24 the pf. after למען is intolerable: we must with Ewald, § 337 *b*, alter the points, and read יִרְאֻתָם.

42. The following passages are left to the reader to examine for himself: to some of them we may, perhaps, have occasion to revert elsewhere. (*α*) Judg. vi. 4. 1 Sam. xxvii. 9. 1 Kings vii. 15. Prov. vii. 8. 1 Sam. xiii. 17. Neh. iii. 14 f.; לא יוּכַל Gen. xlviii. 10. Josh. xv. 63 Kt. 1 Sam. iii. 2. 2 Sam. xvii. 17. (*β*) Gen. ii. 25. Judg. xii. 6. 1 Sam. i. 7. ii. 25. xxvii. 4 Kt. 2 Sam. ii. 28. 1 Kings i. 1. viii. 8. Jer. v. 22. vi. 10. xx. 11. xliv. 22. Ps. xliv. 10. Job xlii. 3. Lam. iii. 7. Cant. iii. 4. Dan. xii. 8. (*γ*) Ex. xxxix. 23. Jer. xiii. 7.

43. At this point it may be worth while, even at the risk of some repetition, to indicate briefly one or two of the more important *general* results which I trust will have become clear in the course of this and the preceding chapter. The reader who has attentively followed the analysis which has been there given of the nature and use of the Hebrew tenses will, I hope, find himself able to appreciate and realise, more fully than was possible at an earlier stage, the truth and purport of the considerations advanced in the Introduction. He will recognise, in the first place, the importance and wide application of the distinction there drawn between *kind* of time and *order* of time. By means of this distinction it at once becomes possible to explain both the theory of the Hebrew tenses and the practice of the Hebrew writers. *Diversity of order is fully compatible with identity of kind;* this explains the theory: *identity of order in no way excludes diversity of kind;* this explains the practice.

'Diversity of order is compatible with identity of kind.' Differences of order (or date), then, are not *necessarily*

attended by concomitant differences of tense: the *future*, as well as the past, may be indicated by the form expressive of the idea of completion; the *past* (under particular aspects), no less than the future, may be described by the form which denotes action as inchoative or incomplete. Each tense, indeed, but especially the imperfect, exhibits a singular flexibility: at the same time it will be clear that this flexibility does not overreach the limits prescribed by the most rigorous logic. The meanings assumed, however divergent, do not in reality involve any contradiction: a fundamental principle can be discovered which will embrace them all—a higher unity exists in which they meet and are reconciled. The idea of incipiency, for instance, need not, as might at first sight appear necessary, be confined to that which is imminent in the future: it may with equal propriety (as has been shewn) characterise the past, or it may afford, by an easy transition, the means of describing contingent or reiterated action. And the steps by which this is effected are intelligible and plain: they rest upon no violent hypothesis, they call for no unnatural or artificial suppositions. Although, however, one paradox which the use of the tenses seems to present is hereby solved, there still remains another difficulty, which these considerations do not touch. If a difference of *tense* is no criterion of difference of *date*, if events occurring at every conceivable moment of time *must* be denoted by two forms, and *may* be denoted by one, how is it possible to avoid ambiguity? In a language of which the cardinal and most vital constituent seems, like an unsubstantial shadow —'par levibus ventis volucrique simillima somno,'—to elude and evade our grasp, how is certainty ever attain-

able? The answer has been already incidentally alluded to more than once. The *context*, carefully and intelligently understood, constitutes the differentiating factor which *fixes* immovably the signification of the tense. Taken by itself the meaning of the tense may be ambiguous and uncertain: a reference to the context—to the whole of which it is itself an inseparable part—makes clear the relation subsisting between them, and so reduces the ambiguity to a minimum.

But, secondly, 'identity of order in no way excludes diversity of kind.' One and the same event may be described either as nascent, or as completed: each tense, therefore, preserves always its own proper force, which must not be lost sight of because difficult of reproduction in another language, or because the genius of our own tongue would have been satisfied with, perhaps, some more obvious mode of expression. The line of demarcation between the two tenses is as clearly and sharply drawn as between the aorist (or perfect) and the imperfect in Greek or Latin. Whichever tense is used, it is used by the writer *with a purpose:* by the choice of the other tense, the action described would have been presented under a more or less modified aspect. הֵן הִפָּה־צוּר וּנְחָלִים יִשְׁטֹפוּ Ps. lxxviii. 20 the change of tense is no less marked, the colouring imparted by it to the description no less perceptible, than in the line '*Conticuere* omnes, intentique ora *tenebant*,' where the effect produced by the variation is closely similar. And often there is a manifest beauty and propriety in the tense selected. Ps. xix. 2–4 the *continual* declaration of the heavens, the *reiterated* announcement of day and night, the *established fact* that this proclamation is audible wherever their dominion extends,

could not be more concisely and expressively indicated than is here done by a simple variation in tense[1]. And few languages would indicate as much with greater ease and neatness, or by a lighter touch. This single instance will suffice to shew how much may be lost by disregarding a seemingly slight and trivial change: to examine and note the exact force of each tense he meets, until practice enables him to catch it instinctively and without reflection, should be the first duty of the student.

---

[1] Compare Jer. xxxvi. 18 (the process of *dictation* described with *precision*).

CHAPTER IV.

The Cohortative and Jussive.

44. We saw above, § 23, how readily the imperfect might lend itself so as to become the vehicle for expressing a volition; and of its use with a permissive force we have already seen examples in § 38. There the imperfect appeared with its form unaltered: and this is often the case, not merely when this permissive force becomes so intensified as to be equivalent to a petition or a command (see, for example, Ps. xvii. 8. xliii. 1. li. 9 f., 14. lix. 2. lx. 3. lxi. 7 f. etc., where it is parallel to the imperative[1]), but also when it is used in the first person[2] to express an intention or desire on the part of the speaker—the mere future 'I shall' gliding insensibly into the more decided 'I will.' But Hebrew possesses two special forms, commonly known as the *jussive* and *cohortative*[3], which are very frequently used to indicate more

---

[1] And add Gen. i. 9. xli. 34. Judg. vi. 39. 1 Kings xv. 19. Is. xlvii. 3. Ps. cix. 7. Job iii. 9. Neh. ii. 3 al. In many of these passages the unshortened form occurs in close proximity to an actual jussive.

[2] Not so often, however, as with the second or third persons, in which the modal force can be less frequently distinguished by the form: cf. 1 Sam. xii. 19. 2 Sam. x. 12. Jer. viii. 14 al. Ps. lix. 17 (cf. 18). 2 Sam. xxii. 50 (cf. Ps. xviii. 50). Judg. v. 3. Job xxi. 3. xxxiii. 31. xlii. 4 (cf. xiii. 13).

[3] I sometimes use the common term *voluntative* to embrace both.

explicitly when the imperfect bears these two significations respectively. Both these forms exist in Arabic in a more complete and original condition than they exhibit in Hebrew: developed at an early period in the history of the Semitic languages, in Arabic after having reached a certain point of perfection, they there remained stationary, without experiencing any of the levelling influences which caused them partially to disappear in Hebrew. They did not, however, suffer so much as the subjunctive mood of the imperfect, which has vanished entirely: on the contrary, they constitute still an integral and most important element in the syntax of the language.

45. The *cohortative* is hardly ever found except with the first person, either sing. or plur. as the case may be. It is formed by adding to the verb the termination הָ־[2] (thus אֶקְטֹלָה; but if preceded by a long vowel it is toneless, like הַ־ *locale*[3], and in accordance with the rule mentioned p. 14, as אָשׁוּבָה), which has the effect of marking with peculiar emphasis the concentration of the will upon a particular object—נֵלְכָה *let us go, we would fain go*, the idea being expressed with more decision and energy, with greater interest and emotion, than by the mere imperfect נֵלֵךְ.

---

[1] See, however, Deut. xxxiii. 16. Job xi. 17. xxii. 21. Is. v. 19. Ps. xx. 4.

[2] Or once הַ־ Ps. xx. 4, cf. 1 Sam. xxviii. 15; and similarly in the imperative once or twice, דְּעָה Prov. xxiv. 14 for the usual דָּעָה, and רְגָה Judg. ix. 29; compare Is. lix. 5. Zech. v. 4. Ezek. xxv. 13 (quoted by Delitzsch).

[3] In thus comparing the הַ־ *locale* with the הָ־ of the cohortative, I do not wish to assert or assume their original identity.

46. The *jussive*, on the other hand, belongs almost exclusively to the second and third persons[1] (in the second person principally after אַל, which is never used with the imperative). It is obtained by shortening the imperfect in such a manner as the form of each particular word will allow: e. g. יַכְרֵת from יִכְרֵת, יִגֹּל (through the intermediate, but of course not actually existing יִגֹּל) from יַגְלֶה (Hif.), תְּגַל for תְּגַלֶּה, etc.[2] Now what is the significance of this abbreviation or apocopation? From the manner in which the jussive is commonly used, it is generally supposed to have arisen from the quickened and hasty pronunciation of a person issuing a command: the curtness and compactness of the form corresponding to the abrupt and peremptory tone which the language of one in such a situation would naturally assume[3]. But the difficulties in the way of accepting this explanation of

---

[1] But see 1 Sam. xiv. 36. Is. xli. 23 Kt., 28. xlii. 6; and cf. Job xxiii. 9, 11.

[2] The analogy between the abbreviated forms in verbs ל"ה and the forms of segolate nouns is very complete and worth noticing: thus יָגֹל : יִגֹּל (presupposed from יִגְלֶה) :: דֶּרֶךְ : דַּרְךָ (presupposed from דַּרְכִּי); with יַעַשׂ cf. נַעַר, with יַחַת, פַּחַת, with תַּחַת, נַצַּח, with אֹרֶא and אֹפֶן, שֹׁבֶט, with יַנַּךְ the rare form נָרֶךְ: in יְהִי from יִהְיֶה, the *yod* becomes vocalized exactly as in פְּרִי (in pause יְהִי); and in יִשְׁתַּחוּ (in pause חֻ־) from יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה the same process is undergone by *waw* precisely as in יָהוּ (in יִשַּׁעְיָהוּ etc.) from יַהְוֶה (cf. also אָחוּ, שָׁחוּ, and with a different vowel תֹּהוּ, נֹהוּ). It should be stated that some of the forms quoted occur only after וַ, and not as independent jussives.

[3] Cf. Ewald, *Gramm. Arab.* § 210: 'cuius [modi iussivi] haec est summa lex, ut forma a fine rapidius et brevius enuncietur, prout ipse iubentis animus commotior, sermo rapidior est.'

the origin of the jussive appear to me to be insuperable: to say nothing of its appearance in the protasis of conditional propositions in Arabic, there are a considerable number of passages in Hebrew where, if we suppose that it *originally* gave utterance to an order or command, it simply mocks any attempt to justify or explain its presence. Not to dwell longer on these difficulties here (as the whole question will be found discussed at greater length in Appendix II), it will be sufficient for the present simply to state my belief that a sounder and more satisfactory hypothesis will be found in the supposition that originally the jussive was a form designed to strengthen and intensify the idea of potentiality which, as we have learnt, is frequently conveyed by the imperfect; that יִרְאֶ֫, therefore, expressing more decidedly and unequivocally than יִרְאֶה the sense *he may* or *might see*, afforded thus the initial element around which the stronger significations of an optative or jussive proper would rapidly attach themselves. The transition to the latter from the weaker permissive signification will then be exactly parallel to what is observable in two strikingly analogous cases presented by Greek. In Greek the idea originally conveyed by the optative mood is that of an indefinite potentiality—'*might*.' Yet so completely is this, its older signification, superseded by the secondary function from which it takes its name, that, except in dependent sentences, it has almost entirely disappeared from the language. Nor is this all. As though to shew the more plainly and unmistakably how a wish or command may find expression through a form properly denoting nothing beyond a possibility, we have a second equally clear instance of the same transition in the use of the

optative with ἄν. The every-day usage of the language shews that in strictness χωροῖς ἂν εἴσω means *you would* or *might go in:* yet we know that phrases such as this are not unfrequently found conveying a command, or notifying a desire, even though they may not exhibit the force and distinctness peculiar to the imperative, or to the optative when standing by itself.

47. So much for the origin and primary meaning of these two modal forms. It only remains to mention, before noticing instances of their use, that in Hebrew many classes of verbs do not admit of the modifications of form by which they are distinguishable from the ordinary imperfect. Thus verbs ל״ה hardly ever[1] receive the ה־ of the cohortative, and verbs ל״א only very rarely. The jussive is seldom distinguishable, except in verbs ע״ו, ל״ה, and the Hif'il generally; while before suffixes both forms are equally incapable of recognition[2]. From this it follows that they are not indispensable elements in Hebrew; and the truth of what was said at the beginning of the chapter about the unaltered imperfect being competent to express any kind of volition becomes self-evident. So, too, it may be noticed that they are not always used, even in cases where their presence might naturally be expected: e. g. Gen. xix. 17. 1 Sam. xxv. 25: Gen. ix. 25 (יהיה, but יהי, יפת): Judg. xix. 11. Is. i. 25. Ps. xxv. 10 etc. Still, however, upon the whole, where the modal forms exist, they are decidedly employed by preference. But although the bare imperfect may perform the functions of the cohortative and jussive, we

[1] Twice: Is. xli. 23. Ps. cxix. 117.

[2] The only exceptions are Is. xxxv. 4. Deut. xxxii. 7. Job xxii. 21.

must be on our guard against hastily assuming the converse change, and allow a passing difficulty to beguile us into supposing that the latter can ever lose their special significance, and lapse into ordinary imperfects. This, however, raises a difficulty which will have to be treated separately.

48. The ordinary usages of the cohortative and jussive are so readily intelligible that a small selection of instances will suffice, the variations in meaning presented by different passages depending entirely upon the tone and manner of the speaker and the position he occupies relatively to the person spoken of or addressed. Both forms, it should be observed, are constantly rendered more emphatic and expressive by the addition of the particle נָא; e. g. Gen. xviii. 21 אֵרְדָה־נָּא; xxvi. 28 תְּהִי נָא; xviii. 30 אַל־נָא יִחַר לַאדֹנָי.

49. The cohortative, then, marks the presence of a strongly-felt inclination or impulse: in cases where this is accompanied by the ability to carry the wished-for action into execution, we may, if we please, employ *I, we will* . . . in translating; where, however, the possibility of this depends upon another (as when permission is asked to do something, or when the cohortative is used, in accordance with its etymological meaning, in the plural, to suggest or instigate), we must restrict ourselves to some less decided expression, which shall be better adapted to embody a mere proposal or petition.

Thus (α) Gen. xii. 2 f. xviii. 21 *I will* go down, now. xxvii. 41. xxxiii. 12 etc. Is. viii. 2. Ps. vii. 18 אֲזַמְּרָה *I will* sing. ix. 2 f. xiii. 6. xviii. 50 etc. Gen. xxii. 5 נֵלְכָה *we* (I and the lad) *will* go. xxiv. 57. xxix. 27.

(β) Gen. xxxiii. 14. l. 5 אֶעֱלֶה־נָּא וְאֶקְבְּרָה *let me* go up,

I pray, and bury my father. Ex. iii. 18 *we would fain* go. xxi. 22 (in the message to Sihon, craving leave to pass through his territory) *let me* pass through. Judg. xii. 5 *I should like* to cross. xv. 1 אֲבֹאָה. 1 Sam. xxviii. 22. 1 Kings xix. 20 etc. Ps. xxv. 2. xxxi. 2, 8. xxxix. 5. lxi. 5. lxv. 5. lxix. 15 אַל־אֶטְבַּעָה O *let me* not (or *may I* not) sink! lxxi. 1. Jon. i. 14[1]: and as a literal 'cohortative,' Gen. xi. 3. xix. 32, and often; Jer. xviii. 18. Ps. ii. 2. xxxiv. 4 etc.; cf. lxxxv. 9. Hab. ii. 1.

50. In the same way, the jussive assumes different shades of meaning, varying with the situation or authority of the speaker: it is thus found—

(*a*) As a 'jussive,' in the strict sense of the term, to convey an injunction or command, Gen. i. 3 יְהִי אוֹר etc. xxii. 12. xxx. 34. xxxiii. 9. xlv. 20. Ex. xvi. 19. Deut. xv. 3. Is. lxi. 10. Ps. xiii. 6. xcvii. 1 etc. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 23[2]; and the same in irony[3], Judg. vi. 31 if he is a god יָרֵב לוֹ *let him* (or *he may*) strive for himself! Is. xlvii. 13. Jer. xvii. 15. xxvii. 18.

Sometimes, from the circumstances of the case, the command becomes a permission: so Num. xxiv. 7 וְיָרֹם and *let* his king *be higher* than 'Agág, 19 וְיֵרֶד and *let* him *rule*. Deut. xx. 5. Is. xxvii. 6 (where observe the simple impf. יָצִיץ parallel to a jussive). xxxv. 1 f. Hos. xiv. 6 f. I will be as the dew to Israel: *let* him flourish וַיַּךְ

---

[1] Cf. Job xxxii. 21 *a* אל־נא אשא פני־איש 'I *hope I may not* shew unfair favour to any one.'

[2] In commands אל (*do not*) and לא (*thou shalt not*) are sometimes found interchanging: see Ex. xxiii. i. xxxiv. 3. Josh. i. 7. Judg. xiii. 14. 1 Kings xx. 8. Ezra ix. 12.

[3] Cf. the imperative 1 Kings ii. 22. Is. xlvii. 12. Job xl. 10.

and strike forth his roots like Lebanon. Zech. x. 7. Ps. lxix. 33 (with a different turn from xxii. 27).

(β) In a somewhat weaker signification, to impart advice or make a suggestion:—

Gen. xli. 33 f. and now יִרְאֶה *let* Phar'oh *look out* a man etc. Ex. viii. 25. Judg. xv. 2. 1 Kings i. 2. Ps. xxvii. 14 (xxxi. 25). cxviii. 1-4. Prov. i. 5. ix. 4 etc.

(γ) To express an entreaty or request, a prayer or wish, and in particular blessings or imprecations:—

Gen. ix. 27. xxxi. 49 Yahweh יִצֶף *watch* between me and thee! xliv. 33 יֵשֶׁב־נָא *let* thy servant remain, I pray. xlv. 5. Ex. v. 21. Num. xii. 12. Deut. xxviii. 8. 1 Sam. i. 23. xxii. 15 etc. Ps. vii. 6. xiv. 7. xxii. 27. xxvii. 9. xxxv. 6. lxix. 26. lxxx. 18 etc. 2 Chron. xiv. 10 *b* (a prayer like Ps. ix. 20).

Obs. In the second person the jussive is very rare, except after אַל, its place being naturally occupied by the imperative; see, however, 1 Sam. x. 8. Ezek. iii. 3. Ps. lxxi. 21 תָּרֶב O multiply my greatness! Dan. ix. 25. A few other instances in which the verb is connected with ו will be considered in the following chapter.

51. Thus far all is plain and clear. The use of both the modal forms is so simple and natural as seemingly to preclude even the possibility of any obscurity or difficulty emerging. And yet we are on the verge of what may be fairly termed the *vexatissima quaestio* of Hebrew syntax.

Does the cohortative ever signify '*must?*' Startling as such a question may appear, after what has been said respecting the nature of this mood, and amply corroborated by the examples cited in proof of it, it is nevertheless a question which has to be asked, and one to which we must endeavour to find, if possible, a satisfactory

answer. The fact is, that a small number of passages exist in which the intention or wish which the cohortative properly expresses, appears to be so limited and guided by external conditions imposed upon the speaker that the idea of impulse from within seems to disappear before that of compulsion from without. So much so is this the case that most modern grammarians do not hesitate to affirm that under such circumstances the cohortative has the signification *must*[1]. Such a sense, however, is so completely at variance with the meaning this form bears elsewhere that considerable caution should be taken before adopting it: indeed, stated absolutely and unreservedly, it cannot be adopted at all. Now it is observable that in almost all the passages in question the doubtful expression occurs in the mouth of a person suffering from some great depression or distress: however *involuntary*, therefore, the situation itself may be in which he is placed, the direction taken by his thoughts is *voluntary*, at any rate so long as his circumstances do not wholly overpower him. His thoughts may, for example, either suggest some action tending to relieve his feelings, or they may form themselves into a wish expressive of disconsolate resignation.

52. By keeping these considerations in mind, we shall generally be able to interpret the cohortative without departing so widely from its usual signification as to do violence to reason. How natural, Ps. xlii. 5, 10, for the exiled poet to find relief[2] in tearful recollections of the

---

[1] Comp. Ewald, § 228 *a*; Böttcher, ii. 186; Hupfeld and Delitzsch on Ps. lv. 3 etc.

[2] This is of course said upon the assumption that Hitzig's objection, that 'pouring out one's soul' is not a voluntary act, is unfounded.

days כי אעבר בסך; or, *v.* 10, to give free course, as Job x. 1, to his plaint! So lv. 3, 18. lxxvii. 4, 7 (the poet *abandons* himself to his distress of mind, and lingers on the painful contrast between the present and the past: notice 7 *c* וַיִּחְפַּשׂ the transition to the language of simple fact, untinged by any emotion), 12 *b* (in *a* retain the K'tib אַזְכִּיר). Is. xxxviii. 10[1] (in *despair*, 'let me go, then; I am ready to die,' the feeling פקדתי יתר שנותי extorts from him the wish to relinquish the life now suddenly become a *βίος ἀβίωτος*). lix. 10 (describing the *frantic efforts* made to find the way[2]). Jer. iii. 25 (in despondent resignation, as perhaps Ps. lvii. 5 with the same verb).

53. In these passages it will be observed that while the usual signification of the cohortative seems at first sight somewhat obscured, there is no necessity to suppose it absent, still less to imagine it superseded by a contrary signification. And, in fact, Ewald's words, § 228 *a*, are only to the effect that the cohortative is used to designate voluntary actions, whether they proceed from perfectly free choice, or are '*at the same time* conditioned from without[3].' This language is perfectly intelligible and consistent; but commentators are apt to forget the limitation

---

Comp., however, the imperative שמכי לב Ps. lxii. 9. Lam. ii. 19; and for the practical identity of נפש and לב in expressions of this sort, comp. Ps. lxi. 3 with cvii. 5. Jon. ii. 8.

[1] Comp., though the tone is different, Gen. xlvi. 30.

[2] Cf. Delitzsch's note: 'the impulse of self-preservation, which drives them in their *ἀπορία* to feel for a way of escape.'

[3] Similarly Delitzsch on Ps. lv. 3: the cohortative not unfrequently denotes '*ich soll* oder *ich muss* von *Selbsterregungen*, die von aussen bedingt sind.'

with which it is accompanied, and to express themselves as though they thought it possible for the cohortative to denote external compulsion ('must') *alone*, to the exclusion of any internal impulse occasioned or suggested by it[1]. Accordingly they find no difficulty in accounting for the presence of the form under discussion in Jer. iv. 19, 21. vi. 10. Ps. lxxxviii. 16, where אשמעה, אפונה etc. seem to be *exclusively* 'determined from without,' in such a manner as to leave the speaker without even the most limited scope for personal choice. But upon what principle the cohortative can then be employed to express such an idea with any propriety, it is impossible to understand; in preference, therefore, to supposing that the ־ָה has in these passages assumed a meaning diametrically opposed to, and incompatible with, that which it holds elsewhere, we may perhaps provisionally adopt the opinion of Hitzig that it has *lost its significance*[2]. This seems certainly to be the case at times with the so-called ־ָה *locale* (in such words as עֶזְרָתָה, עוֹלָתָה, which appear as simple nominatives, or לִישׁוּעָתָה, לִשְׁאֹלָה, where it is at least redundant after the preposition[3]), and is more in accordance with other phenomena of language than the violent transition which the other explanation involves[4].

---

[1] E. g. even Hupfeld is, to say the least, incautious and unguarded in his language on Ps. lvii. 5. lxxxviii. 16.

[2] Hitzig himself explains the other passages in the same way, or else by supposing ־ָה omitted: but in most of them, at any rate, the more emotional and emphatic form appears perfectly appropriate.

[3] See Hupfeld on Ps. iii. 3, and especially Philippi *Wesen und Ursprung des St. constr. im Hebräischen*, pp. 128, 143 f.

[4] The real difficulty lies not in understanding how the original meaning of a termination may have been lost or forgotten, but in

54. It will not surprise us, after we have seen in what manner the idea of incipiency conveyed by the imperfect attaches itself without distinction to actions in the past equally with those in the present, to find that the cohortative is sometimes, though rarely, employed similarly to give expression to the *emotion* or *effort* with which a past action was performed. See Ps. lxvi. 6 (comp., however, Perowne's note). lxxiii. 17 after עד Prov. vii. 7. 2 Sam. xxii. 38 (אֶרְדְּפָה for which in Ps. xviii. אֶרְדּוֹף), probably Job xix. 18. xxx. 26 (on the latter passage, comp., however, p. 73, note); and perhaps Ps. lv. 18 *a* (18 *b*–19 וַיִּשְׁמַע will then describe, not the poet's *conviction* for the future, but his *experience* of the past), and Hab. ii. 1 f. (followed similarly by וְ: but *v.* 1 may be rather a *quotation* of what the prophet had said, exactly as Cant. iii. 2 *a*, followed *b* by the perfect בקשתי). But Ps. lxxxviii. 16 the former difficulty will still be felt: it is not clear how אפונה, whether referring to the past or to the present, can denote a voluntary *ἀπορία*; we must suppose, as above, that here the ה־ is no longer significant. See, further, §§ 70, 84.

55. The appearance of the cohortative after אולי Ex. xxxii. 20 cf. Jer. xx. 10, or לְמַעַן Ps. ix. 15, will not require further comment. In Ps. xxvi. 6. lxxi. 23. lxxvii. 12 it retains its usual force, merely indicating more decidedly than the bare impf. would have done the unconstrained readiness felt by the writer: and in lvii. 5 it is perhaps used

---

understanding how at one and the same time it could have been treated as both significant and non-significant. And yet, even if we accept Hitzig's view as the least repugnant to common sense, this is what must have been done by Jeremiah. I hardly consider that the cases referred to above offer in this respect a satisfactory parallel.

as an expression of defiance. It is found also in the phrase עַד אַרְבִּיעָה or כִּי Jer. xlix. 19. l. 44. Prov. xii. 19.

56. We may now turn to the anomalies presented by the use of the jussive. Not unfrequently in poetry the jussive occurs under circumstances where, from the general context, the simple imperfect would seem the more natural form to employ; and where, owing to the consequent difficulty of marking its special force in translating, its presence is apt to be overlooked. The explanation of this usage will be best introduced and most readily understood, if we first of all notice some instances in which the *imperative* is similarly employed. The difficulty, it will be seen, is this: we seem to require only the statement of a *fact;* we find instead a form preferred which expresses a *command:* are we now to conclude that in such passages the jussive loses its meaning, and may be regarded as equivalent to a simple imperfect? in other words, are we at liberty to disregard the mood altogether, or ought we rather to seek for some explanation which will account for and do justice to the form chosen by the writer? Although a few passages remain unexplained, the analogy of the imperative, the meaning of which cannot be either forgotten or evaded, will lead us to decide in favour of the latter alternative.

57. The appearance of imperative or jussive alike, under the circumstances alluded to, is to be explained partly from the habit poets have of personifying the inanimate objects of nature (e.g. Ps. lxv. 14. civ. 19. cxiv. 3–6. Is. xxxv. 1 f. etc.), or of addressing persons and objects not actually present (e. g. Is. xiii. 2. xxiii. 1 f., 4. xl. 9 etc. Ps. xcviii. 7 f. cxiv. 7 f.); partly from the sympathetic interest they feel in the events or scenes

described, which at times expresses itself openly: the result is that instead of describing an occurrence in the language of bare fact, they often love to represent it under the form of a command proceeding from themselves. Now in the majority of cases, those viz. which resemble Is. xxiii. 1 etc., no difficulty arises: the difficulty first meets us in those passages where the command seems out of place and nugatory, in consequence of the state of things previously described apparently rendering it superfluous and useless. But the fact is, these are only extreme instances; and the two considerations just mentioned will really be found sufficient to explain the anomaly.

Perhaps the strongest case is Is. liv. 14 '*be far* from anxiety, for thou wilt not fear; and from terror, for it will not come nigh thee,' where the imperative occurs in the midst of a series of verbs describing the Ṣion of the future, and is clearly only the more nervous and energetic expression of what in prose would run 'thou *mayest* be far from anxiety,' or (changing the form) 'thou *needst* not be anxious.' Is. ii. 10 and perhaps Ps. lxv. 11 are similar. The construction is more frequent in negative sentences, i. e. with אַל and the jussive: so Ps. xli. 3. Job v. 22. Prov. iii. 25. Is. ii. 9. Jer. vii. 6 (where וְרָם נָקִי אַל־תִּשְׁפְּכוּ, involving a change of construction, is in fact parenthetical).

58. These passages, in all of which the verb is in the second person, and so distinctly imperative, establish a precedent which justifies us in interpreting the instances which follow in the same way, and in declining at a single stroke to rob both the jussive of its rightful force, and the sentence of its full significance. In almost every case

we shall find that by adhering to the strict grammar, rather than by deserting it on account of a superficial difficulty, a more pointed and appropriate sense will disclose itself. (The verb will now be always in the third person.) Ps. xxxiv. 6. l. 3 וְאַל־יֶחֱרַשׁ *and let him not be silent* (the scene is introduced by the pf. הוֹפִיעַ *v.* 2: the writer then, instead of continuing in the same style, and writing simply 'he comes and is not silent,' imagines himself as an eager and interested spectator, praying the Deity, already visible in the distance, to come near, Ps. vii. 7 f., and declare his will). lxvi. 7 (where, however, the jussive is probably to be understood as conveying a *literal* warning). cxxi. 3 (contrast לא 4: 'אל adds to לא the sympathy of the speaker with the expected future, and expresses consequently a hope' (Hitz.): in *v.* 4 this hope is raised to a certainty by לא). Jer. xlvi. 6. li. 3. Zech. ix. 5. x. 7. Job xx. 17 אַל־יִרְאֶה (here, as elsewhere, in depicting the wretchedness of the wicked or the prosperity of the righteous, the interest felt by the writer betrays itself by causing him to glide insensibly from the language descriptive of a fact into that which is expressive of emotion). And without a negative: Job xviii. 9, 12. xx. 23, 26 יִרְעַם (from רָעָה), 28. Ps. xi. 6. xii. 4. lxxii. 8, 13, 16, 17. Deut. xxviii. 8, 21, 36 (where, as in Ps. lxxii, the language of blessing and that of mere prediction seem to blend)[1]. Ps. lxxxv. 14 let justice go before him and etc. (as in the passages quoted from Jer.

[1] Does not Deut. xxxii. 8 gain in force if יַצֵּב be taken strictly, as expressing, namely, a wish that the manner in which the territories of the nations are allotted may be fixed by a continual reference to Israel—the *reason* of the wish following in *v.* 9?

and Zech., a future fact conceived partially under the form of a command).

Hitherto we have not found it necessary or even desirable to relinquish the recognised and usual signification of the jussive. Some other passages, in which the occurrence of this mood seems abnormal, will be explained in the chapters which follow: and a few that remain even then, including those in which, as I believe, the earlier meaning of the jussive is still traceable, will be examined in Appendix II.

Obs. 1. The true character of the cohortative, although now universally recognised, was for long disregarded or unobserved: it was for the first time clearly and convincingly established by Gesenius, in his *Lehrgebäude der Hebr. Sprache* (Leipzig 1817), App. ii. p. 870, where a large number of instances are collected and examined, 'since it is not fair or right that a matter which can be despatched at a single stroke, if one will only submit to the labour of exhaustive investigation, should remain any longer an object of uncertainty and dispute.' Previous grammarians had, however (as Gesenius himself remarks), maintained the same opinion: and, indeed, so soon as Arabic began to be studied systematically, with a view to the illustration of Hebrew, the analogies presented there by the use of the 'jussive' and 'energetic' moods could not fail to arrest attention. Accordingly we find Albert Schultens in his *Institutiones ad fundamenta Linguae Hebraeae* (Lugduni Batavorum 1756), p. 432, asserting that by the addition of ה—'simul *accessionem* fieri *significationis* non ambigendum;' and Schröder, *Institutiones* (Ulmae 1785), p. 198, speaking of it as 'vocum formam et significationem augens.' A few years later, however, Stange in his *Anticritica in locos quosdam Psalmorum* (pars prior, Lipsiae 1791), p. 45, writes as follows on the same subject:—'Quod supra scripsi, ה quod vulgo, idque male paragogicum vocant, non temere vocabulis apponi, sed futuris et imperativis adiectum . . . . exprimere Latinorum coniunctivum aut si mavis subiunctivum, multis fictum et falsum videri facile possum coniicere; nam quae imberbes in Grammaticis non didicimus, ea

fere contemni ac reiici solent: id tamen ex multis exemplis verissimum reperiri, nemini in posterum dubium esse debet.' It appears, then, that in the Hebrew grammars of his day, *quarum tamen numerus infinitus est, ac quibusque nundinis Lipsiensibus augetur* (ibid.), the view thrown out by Schultens and Schröder had met with as little approval as at the time when Gesenius published his *Lehrgebäude*. Stange himself supports his statement by a considerable list of instances, though not so copious or accurate as the one afterwards given by Gesenius.

Obs. 2. The existence of a special meaning attaching to the shortened forms of the impf., at least in the case of the verbs ל״ה, had been previously noticed, though here likewise it was Gesenius who, in the first edition of his smaller grammar (1813), and more fully in his *Lehrgebäude*, confirmed and demonstrated the correctness of the observation. Thus Schröder, p. 212, writes:—'Secunda ratio retracti ex syllaba ultima ad penultimam accentus posita est in singulari emphasi, qua vox pronunciatur, uti fit in mandato, hortatione, precatione, vel in interdicto, dehortatione, deprecatione, vel in voto, vel ubi gravior quidam subest animi adfectus:' compare also Schultens, p. 443. So far, however, as the *theory* here stated is concerned (which is identical with Ewald's, § 224 *a*, *c*, above § 46, *note*), it is singular that, if it be true, the retrocession is not more frequent: except in the few cases cited below, § 71 (where it is to be attributed to the presence of אל), the tone never recedes in the jussive beyond the limits of verbs ל״ה. It is quite plain that the jussive *shortened* (or, as in Arabic, *cut off*) the last syllable of the verb: there seems to me to be no evidence that in doing this it likewise produced any retrocession of the tone. On the jussive forms of verbs ל״ה compare Olshausen, § 228 *a*.

Obs. 3. As regards any ambiguity which may be thought to arise from the use of the unmodified impf. to denote a command or wish, the reader will remember that our own language offers a close parallel. I quote the following from E. A. Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar*, one of the few books on the English language written by Englishmen, in which the method commended in the extract from Gesenius (see Obs. 1) has been admirably carried out, § 365:—'The reader of Shakespeare should always be ready to recognise the subjunctive, even where the identity of the subjunctive with the indicative

inflexion renders distinction between two moods impossible except from the context. Thus:

> "Therefore take with thee my most heavy curse,
> Which in the day of battle tire thee more
> Than all the complete armour that thou wear'st!
> My prayers on the adverse party *fight*,
> And there the little souls of Edward's children
> *Whisper* the spirits of thine enemies,
> And *promise* them success in victory."
>
> *Rich. III.* iv. 4. 190.'

Add further:

> 'But all the charms of love
> Salt Cleopatra, *soften* thy waned lip!' etc.
>
> *Ant. and Cl.* ii. 1. 20–26.

And (from § 364):

> 'For his passage,
> The soldiers' music and the rites of war
> *Speak* loudly for him.'
>
> *Hamlet* v. 2. 411.

CHAPTER V.

The Voluntative with Waw.

59. In the present chapter we have to examine the use of the imperfect when combined, in its capacity as a voluntative, with the simple or *weak* וְ (with *shwa'* וְיִקְטֹל, וְאֶסְלַח: when the first letter of the verb has *shwa'* likewise, we obtain, of course, the forms וְיִדַּבֵּר, וְתִהִי, וְאַגִּדְלָה: these must be carefully distinguished from וַיִּקְטֹל, וָאֶסְלַח, וַיְדַבֵּר, וַתְּהִי, וָאַגַּדְלָה). Inasmuch as the particular signification it then assumes depends upon its being, not a *mere* imperfect, but a *voluntative*, it is important to recollect what was remarked in § 44, that the voluntative force may be really present even though the corresponding modal form does not meet the eye.

60. This weak וְ is used with the imperfect—as a jussive or cohortative by preference, if these exist as distinct forms, though not exclusively even then—in order to express the design or purpose of a preceding act, which it does in a less formal and circumstantial manner than לִמְעַן, בַּעֲבוּר etc., but with much greater conciseness and elegance. An instance or two will make it quite clear in what way this is effected. 1 Sam. xv. 16 הֶרֶף וְאַגִּידָה let alone *and I will tell* thee: inasmuch as it is the wish to tell which occasions the utterance of הֶרֶף,

this is equivalent to saying 'let alone *that* I may tell thee.' Gen. xix. 20 let me flee thither וּתְחִי *and let* my soul live (=*that* it may live). Jer. xxxviii. 20. Ex. x. 17 entreat God וְיָסֵר *and may he* remove (=*that* he remove) from me only this death[1]. In translating, we may sometimes preserve the force of the jussive or cohortative; sometimes it is better to employ *that*: care ought to be taken, however, never to confuse (say) וְיִהִי with either וְהָיָה or וַיְהִי, from both of which it is entirely distinct, but to both of which it may seem superficially similar in meaning—to the former when referring to future time, to the latter when relating to the past.

61. The ambiguity, so far as the future is concerned, arises from the following cause. In English, when we desire to express our opinion that one given event will occur in consequence of another, we commonly employ the *future*, provided that this second event may be viewed by the speaker as more or less probable in itself—not as purely dependent upon the preceding action as its antecedent: in other words, our language *states* only the *post hoc*, leaving the *propter hoc* to be *inferred* from the juxtaposition of the words in the sentence. Thus, if we regard the result as tolerably certain, i. e. if we are tolerably sure of the *post hoc*, we say *and it will* . . .; if as uncertain, we say *that it may* . . .: we *can*, of course, employ the latter form in both instances, but our idiom

---

[1] As this combination of the voluntative with ו expresses an *ulterior issue*, advancing beyond, but regulated by, the principal verb, it is called by Ewald the *consecutive* or 'relatively-progressive' voluntative. (Respecting these terms more will be found in a note to § 67, p. 76.)

prefers the former, if the circumstances will allow its use. Hebrew, on the other hand, employs the latter form *always:* hence it results that the same phrase can be rendered into English by *two* equivalents, one of which at the same time corresponds in addition, so far as the mere words go, to another totally different expression in Hebrew. The fact, however, that *and it will be* corresponds to וְהָיָה as well as to וְיִהִי must not mislead us into imagining the latter to be identical with the former; on the contrary, in both meaning and use the two are quite distinct. To avoid confusion, therefore, it is safer, as well as more accurate, when we meet with a jussive after וְ, either to preserve the jussive form, or to confine ourselves to the perfectly legitimate equivalent, *that* and the subjunctive. In Ex. x. 17 we at once feel that we cannot render *and he shall remove: v.* 21 on the contrary, for וְיִהִי the sense would *permit* the rendering *and there shall be,* the writer, however, as before, brings the result into more intimate connection with the previous act נְגַשָּׁה, *that there may be:* so vii. 19 *a* וְיִהְיוּ that they *may* become, but *b* והיה and there *will* be.

62. The following examples will sufficiently illustrate the construction:—Lev. ix. 6 this shall ye do וְיֵרָא *that* the glory of Yahweh *may appear.* xxvi. 43. Num. xxv. 4. Jer. xiii. 10 וְיִהִי (expressing more than והיה, indicating rather the *intention* presiding over the act אַשְׁחִית 9, *ut sit,* not merely *et erit*). Ps. ix. 10 וְיִהִי *and let Yahweh be* etc., or, in so far as this is a consequence of the characteristics described 8 f., *so* may he be, or *that* he may be: cf. 1 Sam. xxiv. 16 וַיֵּרָא. Ps. xc. 17 וְיִהִי (a deduction from *v.* 16); 1 Sam. vii. 3. xviii. 21. xxviii. 22 (that thou mayest have strength). 1 Kings xxii. 20. Prov. xx. 22 wait for Yahweh

וְיִשַּׁע that he may save thee. Is. v. 19 (parallel לְמַעַן). xxxv. 4. Ps. xxxix. 14 *that* I may look bright. xli. 11 etc.

Instances in which the special forms are not used:—Ex. xiv. 1 וְיָשֻׁבוּ etc. 2 Sam. ix. 1, 3. xvi. 11 וְיִקַּלֶּל. xxiv. 21 (cf. 2 Chron. xxix. 10). Is. xliii. 9 *b*. xlvi. 6 ויעשהו. lv. 7 ויר׳. Job xxi. 19. xxxviii. 35. Jon. i. 11 what shall we do וְיִשְׁתֹּק *that* the sea may be calm? perhaps Ezek. xiii. 11 (only) *that* it may fall! (cf. Ps. xxxvii. 8. xcii. 8). Ps. lix. 14 *and let* them (=*that* they *may*) know. lxxxvi. 17. civ. 32 (that they smoke). Neh. ii. 5 etc.

Where clauses of this nature have to be negatived, לֹא not אַל is almost invariably employed[1]:—Ex. xxviii. 43. xxx. 20. Deut. xvii. 17 וְלֹא יָסוּר (cf. *v.* 20 לְבִלְתִּי סוּר). 2 Sam. xxi. 17. Jer. x. 4. xxv. 6 etc. Here the connection between the two actions is considered to be indicated with sufficient clearness by the וְ, without the need of specifying it more minutely by means of אַל. We do not, however, after לֹא find the jussive or cohortative forms used.

63. The same construction is also found in relation to *past* time: 1 Kings xiii. 33 וְיִהִי *that* he *might* be (not וַיְהִי and he was). 2 Kings xix. 25 וּתְהִי *that* thou *mightest*

---

[1] אל is in fact not used with a verb unless an imperative or jussive force is distinctly felt. Its use is therefore far more restricted than that of the Greek μή, with which it is often compared. Thus in final sentences (as after למען or אשר Gen. xi. 7) לא not אל is always found: and before infinitives לבלתי (= τοῦ μή . . .). Similarly in the case before us אַל is very rare and exceptional, being only found where it is desired to place the second clause upon an independent footing, and to make it co-ordinate with the first: Ps. lxix. 15. lxxxv. 9. 2 Chron. xxxv. 21.

(or mayest) be. Is. xxv. 9 *a that* he *might* save us (not future, as Auth. Ver., because (see *b*) they are represented as already saved!). Ps. lxxxi. 16 *that so* their time might be for ever. Lam. i. 19 that they might refresh their soul (where וַיְשִׁיבוּ could not have stood, as the following words shew). 2 Chron. xxiii. 19. xxiv. 11? Ps. xlix. 10 (where וְיִחִי is dependent upon what precedes, either *v.* 8, or the negotiations which, although broken off, are *implicitly* involved in *v.* 9: *that he should live*).

Obs. It may be wondered how the jussive can find place where, as in these cases, the allusion is to the *past.* We must conclude that in the course of time, the literal meaning of the formula became disregarded or forgotten, and that it was thought of solely with reference to its derived function of connoting succinctly a purpose or intention, quite irrespective of time. The only other alternative would be to suppose that the imperfect, whether in the jussive form or not, is used with a potential or permissive force: 'Whom he liked, he would consecrate, *and he might* become a priest,' 'God is not a man, *and he might* lie:' the liberty thus accorded is unrestricted, in the first case, so far as the principal agent, Yârob'âm, was concerned; in the second case, so far as regards the laws which regulate human conduct. But when it can be predicated of an action or an object that it *empowers* us to act in a certain way, if we choose, the transition is very slight to speaking of it as being performed, or existing, *with a view to* our acting so, *in order that* we might act so. And thus for *and*, we may in English substitute *that*, without any detriment to the sense. (In the second passage the verb might have been pointed וַיְכַזֵּב: see Is. xlviii. 7. But this would have been a stronger expression than וַיִּכְזַב: it would have implied that man actually *did* lie, rather than merely that he *might* lie.)

64. After a negative[1]:—Num. xxiii. 19 God is not a

[1] On some other cases in which similarly the subordinate clause is dependent on the preceding verb *without the negative*, compare my edition of Mosheh ben Shesheth's *Commentary upon Jeremiah and*

man וְיִכְזַב *so that* he might lie (or, *that* he should lie): the force of the expression is well illustrated by a parallel passage 1 Sam. xv. 29 לְהִנָּחֵם *for repenting* (or, *so as* to repent: LXX Num. infin. alone, 1 Sam. infin. with τοῦ). Ps. li. 18 thou desirest not sacrifice וְאֶתְּנָה *so that* I should give it. lv. 13 *a* it was not an enemy who reproached me וְאֶסְבָּלָה *so that* I might bear it: similarly *b* וְאֶסָּתֵר. Is. liii. 2 *b* (if we desert the accents) he had no form or comeliness *that* we might look at him. Jer. v. 28. Ezek. xiii. 6 ויחלו ('depends upon שלחם without the לא' (Hitz.): this passage differs from Jer. xx. 17. Gen. xxxi. 27, in that here the second event is regarded as *resulting from* the first, while in the two latter passages it is viewed simply as *succeeding* it; cf. § 74 *a*).

Or an interrogative:—Is. xl. 25 to whom will ye compare men וְאֶשְׁוֶה *that* I may be like him? xli. 26 ונדעה, 28 *that* I might ask them and that they might return answer. xlvi. 5 *b*. Jer. xxiii. 18 *a* who hath stood in the council of Yahweh *so as* to see? etc. (quite different from *b*, which resembles rather Job ix. 4). Job xli. 3[1].

Obs. Occasionally the ו is dispensed with: Ex. xxviii. 32. xxxix. 23 (the same, narrated when done: 'that it *might* not be torn'). Is. xli. 2 ירך=*to subdue*. l. 2. Job ix. 33. Neh. xiii. 19. And we shall

---

Ezeqiel (Williams & Norgate, 1871), pp. 29, 87. We frequently find ف used in the same way with the subjunctive in Arabic: e.g. Qor'an vii. 17 and do not come nigh to this tree *so as to* become evil-doers (in Engl. we should rather change the form, and say *lest* ye become evil-doers). 71 do not touch her *so that* (*lest*) punishment seize you. See also vi. 108, 154. viii. 48. x. 95. xi. 115. xii. 5 etc.; and after an interrogative, vi. 149. vii. 51 have we any intercessors *that* they *should* intercede for us? vii. 51.

[1] Compare further Job vi. 8–10. xiii. 5.

probably be right in adopting a similar explanation for those passages in which the cohortative appears after מִי יִתֵּן *O that* ...: Is. xxvii. 4. Ps. lv. 7 O that I had the wings of a dove, אעופה ואשכנה *that I might* fly away and be at rest. Job xxiii. 3–5. Compare Judg. ix. 29. Jer. ix. 1, where the cohortative is preceded by ו.

65. Sometimes the *imperative* is found instead of the jussive, to express with rather greater energy the intention signified by the preceding verb[1].

Gen. xii. 2 and I will make thee into a great nation ... וְהְיֵה *and be* (that thou mayest be) a blessing. xx. 7. Ex. iii. 10. 2 Sam. xxi. 3 and wherewith shall I make expiation, וּבָרְכוּ *and bless* (that ye may bless) etc. 1 Kings i. 12 וּמַלְּטִי. 2 Kings v. 10. Ruth i. 9. Ps. xxxvii. 27. cxxviii. 5 may Yahweh bless thee, וּרְאֵה *and see* (that thou mayest see) the prosperity of Jerusalem!

---

[1] Compare Ewald, § 347 *a*.

CHAPTER VI.

The Imperfect with Strong Waw.

66. By far the most usual method in which a series of events is narrated in Hebrew consists in connecting each fresh verb with the clause which precedes it by means of the so-called *waw conversivum* (וַ·) and the imperfect. This waw conversivum, in both meaning and use, is radically different from the simple waw with *shwa'* (וְ), which is likewise prefixed to the imperfect: but it can be always immediately recognised and distinguished from the latter by its peculiar form: before י, נ, and ת the waw conversivum *always* has pathach, with dagesh in the letter following—the dagesh being, however, regularly dropped, from the difficulty of then pronouncing the double letter, before י when accompanied by *shwa'* (וַיְהִי not וַיִּהִי): before א of the first person it has, with all but equal invariability, the compensatory long vowel *qameṣ*[1] (וָאֹבֵא).

---

[1] The only exceptions are a few occasions in Pi'el, where pathach appears: Judg. vi. 9 וַאֲגָרֵשׁ, xx. 6. 2 Sam. i. 10. Ezek. xvi. 10; cf. also Zech. viii. 14. Ps. lxxiii. 16. Job xxx. 26: and, according to some, Ps. xxvi. 6. In Is. xliii. 28 it is probable, as Delitzsch suggests, that the punctuators (like the Targum) interpreted the verbs of the future, and pointed accordingly: LXX and Syriac render by the past.

67. This singular construction is peculiar to Hebrew: outside the limits of the Old Testament it occurs nowhere except in the fragment dating from the ninth century B.C., and preserved upon what is now known as the Moabite Stone[1]. The other Semitic languages do not hesitate to employ what might seem to be the very natural and obvious construction of the perfect and וְ, in cases where the Hebrew regularly makes use of the impf. and וַ: indeed the purest Hebrew almost uniformly shuns the perfect with וְ under these circumstances, and it is not till the later language, and even then only partially, that the latter is able to gain an acknowledged footing. Whatever be the origin of the pathach and following dagesh,—which are the two fundamental and essential[2] elements in the formula as a whole, whether they represent simply a stronger form of וְ, appropriated for this use of the impf.,

---

[1] Where we find not merely ויענו, וירש, וישב, ואחזה, ואהרג etc., but even the apocopated forms ואעש, ואבן, וארא. But the language of this inscription is, in fact, not materially different from Hebrew—even the fem. abs. in *-ath* and the masc. plur. in *-in* are not unknown to the Old Test. (see Ps. xvi. 6. Judg. v. 10)—the resemblance being especially striking in the style and genuine idiomatic colouring. In this respect the language is, at any rate, far freer and purer than that of Qohéleth or Ecclesiastes; but this will, perhaps, be considered feeble praise. (The English reader will find an excellent account of the Stone, attributed to Professor Wright, in the *North British Review*, Oct. 1871: if acquainted with German, he may consult, in addition, the monographs of Nöldeke and Schlottmann.)

[2] The occasional disappearance of the dagesh does not, of course, invalidate the truth of what is said: the doubled letter is just as essential as it is in Pi'el or after the article, notwithstanding the fact that we sometimes find the dagesh omitted; e. g. Ex. iv. 19.

or whether, as seems more probable, they are the only surviving traces of some adverbial root lying concealed between the conjunction and the verb[1],—the principle upon which the *tense* chosen is here employed, and the signification it must bear, will not, after what was said in Chap. III, be far to seek. The imperfect is pre-eminently the tense which expresses what in German is called *Eintritt*, and which represents action as *eintretend*—two terms which may be rendered in English by *ingress* and *ingressive*. A *succession* of events need not invariably be regarded as a mere series of completed and independent wholes: each term may be conceived as having relations with the one preceding it; it may be viewed as *stepping in* after it, as presenting itself to view through an entrance prepared by its forerunner. The date at which the ingress, or entry, is imagined to take place is determined by the ־לְ, which connects the new event with a point previously assigned in the narrative: the goal at which it sets out, the starting-point from which it takes its origin, and to which therefore it is *relative*, is fixed at the termination of the action denoted by the preceding verb. We thus see, firstly, that an event introduced by this construction is represented as *ingressive*, *emergent*, or *nascent*: we see, secondly, that such an event does not then any longer stand by itself, it is the *development*, the *continuation* of the past which came before[2]. And history

[1] Ewald, § 231 *a*, suggests *ad* or אַו (cf. אָוִי, אַוִּי): the literal meaning of ויקרא (for וַאוַּיקרא, וַיַּקרא; cf. וַאעָשׂר Zech. xi. 5 and מצָתי Num. xi. 11) would in this case be '*and then he went on to call*:' see Josh. xxii. 1.

[2] By Ewald the construction is accordingly termed the *relatively-progressive* imperfect (das *bezüglich-fortschreitende* imperfectum).

thus described may be compared to a gradually unfolding roll, in which each turn gently introduces a fresh phase to the eye.

Obs. 1. The title *waw conversive* is a translation of the name וָו הַהִפּוּךְ, which originated with the old Jewish grammarians, who conceived the waw under these circumstances to possess the power of changing the signification of the tense, and turning a future into a past, just as in a parallel case (to be examined hereafter), they imagined it capable of turning a past into a future[1]. Now that the theory of the Hebrew tenses has been entirely remodelled, and it is seen that they involve no intrinsic relation to actions as past or future, but only as completed or incomplete, irrespective of date, considerable objections have been raised against the old designation, and new ones proposed, such as *vav relativum* and *vav consecutivum*[2].

---

[1] Compare Reuchlin, *Rudimenta Hebraica* (Phorcae [Pforzheim] 1506), p. 619, 'Quamquam ne hoc quidem omiserim quod mihi de vau praepositiva particula humanissimus praeceptor meus ille Iacobus iehiel Loans doctor excellens (misericordia dei veniat super eum) apud Cecios discenti monstravit, Cum enim vau per seva notatum praeponitur verbo praeteriti temporis quod transfert accentum suum in ultimam, tunc idem verbum mutatur in tempus futurum . . . . Similiter cum praeponitur vau cum patha verbo futuri temporis, tunc futurum convertit in praeteritum.' Cf. L. Geiger, *Johann Reuchlin*, pp. 105 ff. And so Glass, *Philologiae Sacrae* (Jenae 1634), p. 560, ed. Amst. 1711:—'Specialiter observandum quod praeter copulandi usum, in verbis significationes commutet, praeteriti in significationem futuri, et contra.'

[2] *Vav relativum* is a term still retained by Hitzig: its meaning will be evident after what has been stated in the text. It is, however, a somewhat indistinct and vague expression, and not sufficiently characteristic and decided for the boldly-defined construction it is employed to designate. *Vav consecutivum*, originally suggested in 1827 by Böttcher, has been adopted by Ewald and most modern grammarians and commentators. Certainly by its adoption we gain a convenient and uniform nomenclature, which embraces under a

Certainly, inasmuch as there is now no longer any 'future' or 'past' to need 'conversion,' the sense formerly attached to the term *waw conversive* must be given up. But this term has one great merit, the advantages of which cannot be over-estimated: it is a strongly distinctive expression—a sign admirably adapted to keep the thing signified separate from anything which it may superficially resemble, and which may hence be liable to be confused with it in the mind. Nor is the term incapable of justification, even from the modern point of view. As Ewald, § 231 *b*, remarks, the *and* or *and then* brings the action described into a definite relation with some fixed point in the previously completed past, *from and out of which* it is regarded as arising and originating: now take away the 'and' which thus determines this relation (the 'vav relativum,' as it is called above), and the *perfect* will be the natural tense to employ, because all reference to the previous past is gone, the connection of the action with its own antecedents is severed, and it is contemplated exclusively from the writer's present. Although, therefore, the 'waw

---

single category three separate usages—the consecutive or 'relatively-progressive' *voluntative* (the subject of Chap. V in this book), the consecutive or 'relatively-progressive' *imperfect* (the subject of the present chapter), and the consecutive or 'relatively-progressive' *perfect* (to be explained in Chap. VIII). But the title *waw consecutive*, to a person hearing it, seems naturally to suggest only the *first* of these constructions, in which the second verb indicates an action expressly and designedly *consequent* upon the first: and even if its meaning be modified so as to include the other two, it must still obviously remain always ambiguous, without some additional word specifying which of the three is intended. And the danger from this source of confusion arising between the first and second usage is not diminished by the fact that the same voluntative *form* appears in both—after ·ו no less than after ו. It has been mainly with a view to preclude the possibility of any such confusion that I have thought it better to adhere to the term *conversive*: the name *consecutive*, had it not thus met with another application, I should have felt inclined to appropriate to the usage described in Chap. V, which it seems to me exactly fitted to describe.

conversive' does not change the meaning of the tense, it does alter the aspect under which an action is conceived; it presupposes a point of view which demands on our part an effort of thought before it can be appreciated and realised: it effects a modification sufficiently marked to render the retention of the old distinctive title not merely defensible but desirable.

Obs. 2. The explanation here given of the nature of this construction (which is, in effect, merely Ewald's thrown with a little expansion into an English dress) was written before I had seen the following passage of Schröder's *Institutiones ad fundamenta linguae Hebraeae* (Ulmae 1785), pp. 261 f., in which, in all essential points, the same view is not only anticipated, but stated also with singular lucidity:—'Praeter varios hosce usus, Futurum habet adhuc alium plane singularem, et Hebraeis peculiarem, quod illud vim accipit nostri Praeteriti, et rem revera praeteritum designat, non tamen per se, et absolute, sed in relatione ad praecedens aliquod Praeteritum, spectatam. Quando enim diversae res factae, quae continua quadam serie aliae alias exceperunt, narrandae sunt, Hebraei primam quidem per Praeteritum, alias autem subsequentes, quas, ratione praecedentis, tamquam futuras considerant, per Futurum exprimunt. Hoc itaque, quia id, quod in relatione ad aliam rem praeteritam posterius et futurum fuit, notat, *Futurum relativum* dici potest.' I have thought this paragraph worth transcribing, both for its own sake, and also because it seems only fair that, at least if they are known, the merits of past explorers should receive recognition at the hands of the present generation.

68. This use of the imperfect, which is so characteristic and important as to demand a separate chapter for its analysis, is, however, at the same time, closely parallel to some of the constructions already noticed in § 27. In instances such as אָז יָשִׁיר, וְהָאֲנָשִׁים יִנְחָשׁוּ, וְאַבְשָׁלֹם יָבֹא, the imperfect depicts action as incipient (*began to* . . ., *went on to* . . .) in strict accordance with what appears to have been the primitive signification of the tense: it is just in virtue of this, its original meaning, that, in coalition with וְ, it grew up into a fixed formula, capable of being

generally employed in historical narrative. That a series of past facts should ever have been regularly viewed in this light (a supposition without which the construction before us remains unaccountable), that in each term of such a series the salient feature seized upon by language should be not its character as past, but its character as nascent or ingressive, may indeed appear singular: but the ultimate explanation of it must undoubtedly lie in the mode of thought peculiar to the people, and here reflected in their language. Only, inasmuch as the formula became one of the commonest and most constant occurrence, it is probable that a distinct recollection of the exact sense of its component parts was lost, or, at any rate, receded greatly into the background, and that the construction was used as a whole, without any thought of its original meaning, simply as a form to connect together a series of past events into a consecutive narrative.

NO (yaqtul) preterite

69. The form which the imperfect takes after the וְ is, however, very generally modified. It frequently, at any rate externally, resembles the voluntative—in the second and third person appearing as a *jussive*, in the first person as a *cohortative*. Without going here with any minuteness into the details (which must be sought in the larger grammars, such as Kalisch's, which treat the accidence at length), we meet, for example, regularly with such forms as these, וַיֵּצֵא, וַיַּעַשׂ[1], וַיֵּבֶךְ, וַיָּבֹא, וַיִּגְדַּל,

[1] In so far as verbs ל״ה are concerned, Böttcher, ii. 196 f., collects of the first pers. sing. forty-nine instances of the shortened form, against fifty-three in which it remains unabbreviated. In the other persons, however, the full form is very exceptional; e.g. ויהיה

וְאֲדַבְּרָה etc. A second noticeable characteristic is this, that after waw conv. *the tone frequently*, though not universally[1], *recedes*. Accordingly we obtain וַיִּנָּרֹשׁ, וַיֵּאָסֵף וַתִּתְפַּעֲם Dan. ii. 1, וַיֵּלֶךְ, וַיֹּלֶךְ, וַיָּקָם, וַיִּשֶׁת etc.

Obs. The cohortative form is so much less common than the jussive, that a few particulars respecting its usage (derived chiefly from Böttcher, ii. 199) will not be out of place. It is met with occasionally at all periods in the history of the language, though only at rare intervals except in two or three of the later writers. Thus in the older period, Gen. xxxii. 6. xli. 11. xliii. 21. Judg. vi. 9 f. x. 12. xii. 3. Ps. iii. 6. vii. 5. 2 Sam. xxii. 24. Ps. xc. 8; in the middle period, Jer. xi. 18. xxxii. 9. Ps. lxix. 12, 21 (? see the *Academy*, 1870, p. 257): it never occurs, however, in the books of Kings, or in Isaiah (unless we ought to recognise it in xliii. 28: cf. § 66, *note*). It is principally found in those portions of Daniel, 'Ezra, and Nehemiah where the narrative is told in the first person. In Ezra vii. 27–ix. 6 there are seventeen instances of the first pers. with *-ak*, against only two without it (there is a third case, however, in x. 2): it is here that its predominance is most marked. In Dan. viii–xii I have noticed ten cases with against eight without it (verbs ל״ה of course not reckoned); and in Neh. i. ii. iv–vii. xii. 31. xiii. the numbers are about thirty-two to thirty-seven. It also occurs several times in Ps. cxix. But (according to Böttcher) it is never used by the writer of the Chronicles: a comparison of 1 Chron. xvii. 8 with 2 Sam. vii. 9 would seem to shew that he even intentionally rejected it: nor is it found in Zech. i–viii. although ואמר occurs fifteen times and ואשוב twice. In Esther, neither form is met with at all.

---

never, ויראה four times (against some 130 instances of ויראו). 'It is noticeable,' Böttcher adds, 'that in the whole Pentateuch there occur of the first pers. with הָ only two instances (Gen. xxiv. 48. Deut. i. 16 ff.), of the other persons none at all.'

[1] Never in the first pers. sing. (in 1 Kings xxi. 6, Ezek. xvi. 6 the retrocession is occasioned by position), and by no means always in the other persons: in pause, too, the tone reappears on the ultima, as וַיֵּלֶךְ׃.

70. We have here to ask two questions: firstly, what is the meaning of the apparently modal forms? secondly, what is the cause of the retrogression of the tone?

It is maintained by Ewald, § 231 *a*, that the imperfect after ·ו possesses really a modal force: and he remarks in a note that such an assumption is especially necessary on account of the ה־ in the first person, which cannot otherwise be explained. Certainly the coincidence is a remarkable one, and constitutes a *prima facie* argument in favour of this view, which it is unquestionably difficult to meet. The same distinction of usage between the first person on the one hand, and the second and third on the other, is observable here, precisely as when the usual voluntative force is indisputably present: the former appears as a cohortative, the two latter as jussives. But the impossibility of giving a satisfactory or even an intelligible account of the presence of a *real* cohortative or jussive in forms descriptive of simple historical fact, constrains us to seek for some better explanation. Let us begin by considering the case of the first person. The sense borne by the cohortative is clear and unmistakeable: it may be conveniently and briefly summed up in the word *intentional.* What, however, is the part taken by the characteristic ה־ in producing it? Does the *-ah add* to the simple imperfect the intentional signification? or is that signification already there, and is it rather the office of the *-ah* merely to *bring it out?* The fact that the imperfect may—and in verbs ה״ל, if such an idea is to be expressed at all, *must*—in its unmodified form signify an intention or desire, would seem to tell in favour of the latter supposition, which is corroborated by the further consideration

that the *-ah* is not peculiar to the impf., but is likewise frequently found appended to the imperative as well: upon this view the function of the ה־ is simply to *intensify* the force of the tense: the intentional *nuance* is already there, it is only rendered more prominent, made more perceptible, by the new termination. The termination is not specially cohortative or intentional, it is *merely intensive;* but being appropriated by the usage of the language for the purpose of adding energy, not to the other ideas conveyed by the imperfect (which indeed are not of a character to require it), but pre-eminently to the expression of a *desire*, it wears the appearance of being originative, while, in fact, it is purely ancillary. This being so, it becomes intelligible how it might be employed upon other occasions as well, if circumstances were favourable, and no ambiguity could arise. Now in the case before us, there is no room for ambiguity after the ·ל (לְ): we perceive at once that the context in which the word occurs is wholly historical. And, secondly, all the instances possess obviously one common characteristic: each is an embodiment of the *personal experiences* of the narrator—in each he describes some deed he had himself achieved, some scene in which he had been the most prominent actor, some sentiment or emotion peculiar to his own breast. But it is just upon occasions such as these that a passing indication of the interest taken by the speaker in the facts described, or of the spirit which animated him as he performed them, is natural and true to life. For giving expression to such a feeling the intensive *-ah* is exactly adapted. It marks, briefly but suggestively, the narrator's sense of the position and importance belonging to the action characterised: it

declares the attitude in which he executed his part, the energy with which he threw himself into the work of accomplishing the task which lay before him. Such is the function of this termination stated generally: the particular context in which a word occurs will determine what precise effect it is intended to have—whether, for example, as Judg. vi. 9 f. 1 Sam. ii. 28, it emphasizes the assertion of some solemn fact which the speaker has himself accomplished, or the statement of a truth (Ps. xc. 10) in which he is personally concerned, or whether, as in 'Ezra and Nehemiah, it emphasizes the language which narrates the personal recollections of the past.

71. But for the second and third persons a different explanation must be found. It is, in the first place, obviously impracticable to do anything with the jussive, taken in its literal sense: a command, a permission, or a wish are all equally out of place in a form descriptive of the simple straightforward past. But even supposing we could overcome this difficulty by weakening and generalizing the force of the jussive mood in the manner attempted by Ewald[1], there still seem to be objections

[1] Ewald, § 231 *a*, justifies the presence of what he conceives to be an actual voluntative on the ground that this form in itself at once puts the action described into motion, and so into an attitude of dependence on something else: in other words, the action is *mobilized*, and then requires some fixed point to which to attach itself; which is here supplied by the ·ו in the manner indicated in the text, § 67. But the unaltered imperfect is competent (as we know) to 'mobilize' an action: and the dependency traceable in the jussive is something very dissimilar to the dependency present in the ·ו. In the former case, the dependency is negative and obstructive; in the latter, it is positive and progressive: with the jussive it is not the primary con-

against imagining the form to be that of a real jussive. In the first place, the alterations arising from abbreviation or apocopation *extend over a much wider area* than in the case of the actually existent jussive. Thus the jussive proper in the first person is extremely rare: but not only do we meet with וְאֵשֵׁב, וְאוֹלֵךְ etc., but some fifty instances are cited of verbs ל״ה, which appear thus in the shortened form, some of them, as וְאֶרֶא, וְאֶהִי, being of repeated occurrence. And, secondly, the old termination of the second and third plural ן-, which never occurs where the verb possesses a jussive force[1], is certainly found after וַ, e. g. Deut. i. 22. iv. 11. Judg. viii. 1. xi. 18. Is. xli. 5 al. On the other hand, there are phenomena which seem to reveal the direction in which the true explanation must be sought. The question was asked just now, What is the cause of the retrocession of tone observable e. g. in וַיֶּאֱסֹף? It cannot be accounted for by the supposition

---

sideration, and it operates only by retarding the wished-for event; with the וַ it is directly involved, and it issues in preparing the way for its introduction. I hope I have not misrepresented Ewald's view in this note: I do not feel sure that I understand the sense of the words *als von irgend etwas erst abhängig* in § 223 *c* (cf. 136 *a*), nor do I derive material assistance from the explanatory addition § 231 *a* 'sofern dieser die handlung selbst *schon in bewegung und folglich* abhängig oder irgendwo sich fest anknüpfend sezt,' which, if anything, only increases the obscurity that appears to me to hang over this conception of dependency as attaching to the jussive. But, however this may be, nothing short of desperation could surely suggest such a sentence as this:—'The idea of the voluntative in no way tells against its application here, so soon as it is only conceded that, in a somewhat wider import, it might denote generally that which is dependent and relative.' Only, what a concession!

[1] Böttcher, ii. 172. 200: compare, however, Ewald, § 225 *a*.

that the verb after וַ is a jussive, because יֹאסַף, יִשְׁרֶת etc. are unheard of as independent jussive forms: where they do appear, their occurrence is in no way connected with the modal form as such, but is an accidental consequence of external circumstances. Thus, for example, Ps. cii. 19 תִּכָּתֵב־זֹאת, Job xxii. 28 יָקָם־לָךְ, Ps. civ. 20 תָּשֶׁת־חֹשֶׁךְ, the retrocession is evidently occasioned by the desire to obviate the concurrence of two tone-syllables: it is therefore occasioned by the accidental circumstance of *position*. In verbs ל״ה, as יִגֶל, the vowel in the ultima (as in the segolate nouns) is an auxiliary vowel; and the place of the tone is thus a secondary phenomenon: here, therefore, the apparent retrocession is due to the weak letter which constitutes the third radical of the verb. In no case is the jussive mood by itself sufficient to produce retrocession; nor, in fact, does it shew the slightest tendency to produce it. Even supposing, therefore, that the verb after וַ were jussive, this would fail to account for the retrocession of the tones. It can hardly be doubted that the true cause lies in the *heavy prefix* וַ, which was once probably, as the dagesh seems to shew, even heavier than it is now. The effect of this being added to the impf. would be to create a tendency to *lighten* the latter part of the word, which would operate sometimes by simply causing the tone to recede, sometimes by giving rise to an accompanying apocopation. It must be remembered that we have not much opportunity of watching in Hebrew the changes produced by an alteration at the *beginning* of a word: most of the variations in the vowels or the tone are the results of alterations at the *end* of a word, or of some modification in its relation to what follows it in the sentence rather

than to what precedes. Thus the *st. constr.*, the addition of a suffix, the presence of a heavy termination (קִטְלֹתָם, in contradistinction to a light one קִטְלֹת), the proximity of a tone-syllable, all operate from below: instances of an influence working in the opposite direction are more difficult to find. The article, though followed, like ·ל, by dagesh, does not in Hebrew affect the termination of the word to which it is prefixed, or alter the position of the tone[1]. We are not, however, left entirely destitute of any indications as to the effect which a heavy prefix, in constant coalition with a flexible verb-form, might be expected to produce. There are a few instances in which אַל[2], when closely united to a jussive by *maqqeph*, gives rise to an alteration in the form of the verb similar to that observable after waw conversive: thus Ex. xxiii. 1 אַל־תִּשָּׂא, 2 Sam. xvii. 16 אַל־תָּלֶן: see further Deut. ii. 9. iii. 26. 1 Sam. ix. 20. 1 Kings ii. 20. Prov. xxx. 6, cf. Ex. x. 28. Compare also אַל־תִּשְׁתְּ, exactly like וְתִשְׁתְּ, whereas without אל the full form ישתה is used with a jussive force Job xxi. 20. And probably Ps. xxi. 2 Qri מַה־יָּגֵל and the *ṣere* in שָׁיוֹלֵךְ Qoh. v. 14[3] are to be explained in the same way[4]. The case, then, as a whole,

---

[1] In Arabic the addition of the art. does make a change in the termination: like the *st. constr.*, it removes the so-called 'nunation.' Thus *kitabun* book, *'alkitâbu* the book; *sâ'atun* hour (שעתא Dan. iii. 6 etc.), *'assâ'atu* the hour.

[2] See Ewald, § 224 *b*; Böttcher, i. 166. ii. 172; Olshausen, § 229 *c*.

[3] Compare the shorter form after אז 1 Kings viii. 1 אז יקהל.

[4] In the Psalm, however, the retrocession might be caused by the following tone-syllable מאד (the *shwa'* not reckoning, precisely as Gen. i. 11: Kalisch's remark, therefore, § 11. 5 *end*, requires qualification, see Gesenius, Lg. § 51. 1 *d* Anm. 1, or Ewald, § 100 *a*).

may be stated thus. On the one hand, the forms under discussion cannot be explained as jussives (for the jussive as such never assumes them), nor can they be explained as arising from position (for they are found where no tone-syllable follows): they can only be explained as arising from the influence of the וַ֫ (for the presence of this is the one property they possess in common), and this opinion is confirmed by the parallel instances which have been just quoted[1].

Obs. There is one remaining ground upon which it might be thought possible still to defend the assumption of a jussive. Granted the power of the וַ֫ to alter the place of the tone, it will be urged that such forms as וַיִּשְׁמֹר, וַיָּקָם would be most naturally treated as derived immediately from the *jussives* יִשְׁמֹר, יָקָם, rather than from the simple imperfects יִשְׁמֹר, יָקוּם. This certainly sounds plausible: but it must be remembered that no basis exists for the assumption that יִשְׁמֹר in וַיִּשְׁמֹר must necessarily and exclusively be *jussive:* the וַ֫, which is able to produce וַיִּשְׁאַר, וַיִּשְׁבַּח etc., is a sufficient cause to account for the presence of *ṣere* in וישמר; and when it had gone

---

[1] Ewald himself accounts in the same way for an analogous phenomenon in Arabic (*Gram. Arab.* i. p. 124). *Lam*, 'not yet,' always takes an impf. after it, just as מרם generally does in Hebrew: but the impf. is universally in the *jussive* mood. Thus the unmodified impf. of *nazzala*, 'to bring down,' is *yunazzilu* (he *will, used* etc. to bring down), whereas the jussive is *yunazzil;* and so we find Qor. iii. 144 *lam yunazzil* in the sense of 'he has not yet brought down,' 185 *lam yaf'alú* (not *yaf'alúna*) 'they have not yet done.' The conjunction is always closely followed by the verb, no intervening words being permitted: accordingly Ewald writes, 'Quare ob nexum hunc praepositi لَمْ vique certâ pronunciandi necessarium et perpetuum forma verbi in fine *brevius* pronunciatur.' And if a double origin for the shortened form is postulated for Arabic ('ex duplici quae formam decurtatam postulet causa,' ibid.), it may be conceded, without any greater hesitation, for Hebrew.

thus far, when it had produced וַיָּשֶׁת[1] out of וַיָּשִׁית, the tendency visible elsewhere could not have failed to operate here likewise, so as from יַשֶּׁת to give rise to יָשֶׁת[2]. Such instances only require us to suppose *two* stages in the action of the ·וַ: the possibility of the first stage is fully made out by the effects observable in other cases, and when once this is admitted, the second will follow as a matter of course.

NO

72. The form before us, then, is only apparently, not really, jussive: it exhibits, in fact, one of those *accidental coincidences* not unknown to language. Why the shortened form was selected for the jussive we do not know; we know only the fact that it was so selected: we seem, at least partially, to detect some reasons why it appears after ·וַ, but there is not the slightest indication that the identity of form in the two cases, such as it is (for we have seen that it is not perfect throughout), originated in an intentional adoption of the jussive as such.

73. We may now proceed to examine the manner in which this construction is employed: and, in the first place, let us enquire more closely into the nature of the relation in which an action thus introduced may stand towards the preceding portion of the narrative. The most obvious and frequent relation is naturally that of simple historical succession, Gen. iv. 8 and Qáyin rose up וַיַּהַרְגֵהוּ *and slew* him: but of this there is no need to give further examples, as they abound upon almost every page of the Old Testament.

74. At times, however, when of the two ideas thus

---

[1] Through an intermediate *yâshkth*, Ewald, §§ 33 *b*. 224 *a*, Olsh. §§ 57 *b*. 228 *a*.

[2] This indeed is the form which almost everywhere occurs: see, however, Gen. xlvii. 11, and Böttcher, § 497. 9.

connected, one is really a *consequence* of the other, it is convenient and desirable to make this fact more explicit in English by translating *and so:* similarly, where the two ideas are in reality *contrasted* we may with advantage make the contrast more perspicuous by rendering *and yet.*

Thus (*a*) Gen: xx. 12 *and so* she became my wife. xxiii. 20 וַיָּקָם *and so* the field was ensured to Abraham. Ps. xcii. 11. Jer. xx. 17 because thou didst not kill me from the womb *so*[1] *that* my mother might have become my tomb (the two verbs are strictly co-ordinated under אשר, but the relation between them in English can hardly be exhibited except as above). Gen. xxxi. 27 why didst thou not tell me וָאֲשַׁלֵּחֲךָ *and so*[2] I could have sent thee away (='that so I might have sent thee away,' or more freely, but avoiding the change of mood, 'and so give me the opportunity of sending thee away') with mirth?

(*β*) Gen. xxxii. 31 I have seen God face to face, וַתִּנָּצֵל *and yet* my soul is delivered. xlix. 24 *and yet* he dwelt (in spite of 23). Ex. viii. 15 ויחזק. Deut. iv. 33 did ever people hear the voice of God . . . וַיֶּחִי *and* live (=*and yet* live)? v. 23. 2 Sam. iii. 8 *and yet* thou visitest upon me. xix. 29 ותשת. 2 Kings xviii. 24 *and yet* thou trustest. Is. xlix. 14. Mal. i. 2. iii. 15.

75. But chronological sequence, though the most usual, is not the sole principle by which the use of וְ

---

[1] וַתְּהִי is, however, not the same as יִתְּהִי: could we retain the *same* person in translating, we should escape all danger of confusing them, thus: '*because thou didst* not kill me *and let* my mother become my tomb.'

[2] Above, 'so' pointed to the actual consequences of a real occurrence, here it points to the imaginary consequences of a hypothetical occurrence (*killing, telling*).

conv. is regulated. Abandoning this, a writer may, if he please, suffer himself to be guided by association in *thought*, rather than by association in *time*: he may thus prefer to mention some fresh fact in the connection in which it rises up before his mind, trusting to the reader to assign it to its proper position as regards the rest of the narrative. Thus we sometimes find first of all an event described generally, as a whole, and then some detail accompanying or connected with its occurrence appended afterwards by ·וְ. On other occasions, the ·וְ is used to introduce the mention of a new feature helping to fill in or amplify the picture: each fresh circumstance thus detailed causing the scene to *grow* in the imagination of the narrator or his reader, and affording consequently a natural and suitable occasion for the employment of this construction.

Thus (*a*) Gen. xxiv. 30[1] (describing more minutely the details of Laban's running *v.* 29). xxvii. 24 ff.[1] xxxvii. 6 ויאמר (specifying more closely the manner in which ויגד *v.* 5 took place). xli. 56 ויחזק (a circumstance synchronizing with וישבר). Ex. ii. 10 she called his name Moses, *and said*[2]. iv. 25[1]. xl. 18 (see 17). Judg. xi. 1. Neh. ii. 9 *b*.

---

[1] These references I owe to Hitzig, *Jeremia*, p. 288: compare, further, Böttcher, ii. p. 214, and especially Ewald, *Komposition der Genesis* (1823), pp. 151–156, from whose instances I select, in addition, Gen. xlii. 20 ff. (the compendious ויעשו־כן given in detail in the following *vv.*). Num. xiii. 21–24 (where cf. Keil). Josh. iv. 11–13. On such occasions (in Ewald's words) the narrator 'überspringt Mittelglieder um das Ziel zu erreichen:' he is then compelled 'durch Nebenumstände zu erläutern und zu ergänzen, was seine Eile eben überspringen hatte.'

[2] Elsewhere we find כי as Gen. iv. 25. xvi. 13. Ex. ii. 22 etc., or לאמר as 1 Sam. iv. 21; or ותאמר precedes ותקרא as Gen. xxix. 33 etc.

Is. xxxix. 1 he sent messengers וַיִּשְׁמַע *and* (or *as*) he heard[1] (parallel 2 Kings xx. 12 כי שמע).

(β) Gen. ii. 25. v. 5 ויהיו. vi. 11 etc. (fresh facts mentioned by the writer, in no *chronological* relation with those named in the preceding *vv.*). xlvi. 18, 25. Num. x. 35. 1 Sam. xiv. 49. Ruth ii. 23 *b* (contemporaneous with *a*); 2 Kings xvii. 17 ff. (reflections of the author only connected in thought with the preceding narrative). Num. xv. 32; Prov. xii. 13. Job xiv. 10 *b* וינע (introduces a new statement parallel to that in *a*).

76. But we meet with more extreme cases even than these, though it is true only very rarely: a writer may employ the וְ not merely by joining it to other verbs in the manner just explained, but by joining it to a *substantive standing alone*, without any verb immediately connected with it, in order to express some circumstance or attribute attaching to it; the וְ will then be best rendered by some relative expression. Thus Josh. xxii. 17 is the iniquity of Pe'ôr too little for us . . . ויהי *when* there was (lit. *and* there was) the plague in the congregation?

---

[1] Or ought we to suppose with Delitzsch that the reading here has arisen out of that in Kings by the corruption of כ into ו? LXX has γάρ, and Peshito ܕܫܡܥ. We certainly find the two letters confused elsewhere: 1 Sam. ii. 21 (where in the *Speaker's Commentary*, 'that' must be a slip of the pen for 'when:' the *that* which follows ויהי is, of course, always represented by וְ, and, moreover, requires an intervening adverbial clause) כי פקד makes no sense, and we must from LXX restore ויפקד; similarly Jer. xxxvii. 16. Compare also, in the Heb. text itself, 1 Chron. xvii. 14 וכסאו for כסאך 2 Sam. vii. 17; and in LXX ו for כ 1 Sam. ii. 33. iv. 7. xxiv. 20. 2 Sam. iii. 21. v. 6 (apparently הסירו). vii. 16. xiv. 10. xix. 7 (LXX 6), and כ for ו 1 Sam. i. 23 (so too Pesh., and rightly). 2 Sam. xx. 1.

Is. xlix. 7 for the sake of Yahweh who is faithful, (and) the Holy One of Israel *who* hath chosen thee (lit. '*and* he hath chosen thee:' the conception is amplified by a fresh idea loosely appended by the help of ·וְ). Num. iv. 40, 44. x. 28 these are the journeyings וַיִּסְעוּ *as* or *which* they journeyed (cf. Gen. xxxvi. 14, 32). xx. 15 (expansion of the תלאה *v.* 14). xxxiii. 3.

It is sometimes used in order to explain and define עשה, as Gen. xxxi. 26. 1 Sam. viii. 8. 1 Kings ii. 5. xviii. 13 (וָאֶחְבָּא = *how* I hid): cf. Neh. xiii. 17.

Obs. It is a moot and delicate question how far the imperfect with ·וְ denotes a *pluperfect*. There is, of course, no doubt that it may express the *continuation* of a plupf.: e. g. Gen. xxxi. 34 had taken *and placed* them; but can the impf. with ·וְ *introduce* it? can it instead of conducting us as usual to a *succeeding* act, *lead us back* to one which is chronologically anterior? The point is one of sufficient importance to merit a brief consideration here. The impf. with ·וְ is, in the first place, certainly not the usual idiom chosen by Hebrew writers for the purpose of expressing a plupf.: their usual habit, when they wish to do this, is to *interpose* the subject between the conjunction and the verb, which then lapses into the *perfect*, a form which we know, § 16, *allows scope* for a plupf. signification, if the context requires it[1]. This will be evident from the following examples:—Gen. xxiv. 62 ויצחק בא and Isaac *had come:* the writer wishes to combine two streams, so to speak, in his narrative: he has (1) brought Ribhqah to the termination of her journey, but (2) desires to account for Isaac's presence at the same spot. In order thus to prepare the way for their meeting, he is obliged to *go back*, and detail what had taken place *anterior* to the stage at which his narrative has arrived: he therefore *starts afresh* with the words ויצחק בא, the whole of *vv.* 62 f. bears reference to Isaac, and the

[1] It will be understood that the pf. in this position does not *always* bear a plupf. signification: it is often so placed simply for the purpose of giving emphasis to the subject (see further App. I).

two streams, terminated respectively by וילך *v.* 61 and וירא *v.* 63, *converge* in ותשא *v.* 64. So xxxi. 19 ולבן הלך and Laban *had gone* away (before Jaqob left Paddan-arám, 18 f.: ותגנב, because the possibility of Rachel's stealing the Terâphim is a consequence of Laban's absence), 34. Num. xiii. 22 *had* been built. Josh. xviii. 1 (ותכָּבש would have suggested that the subjugation was *subsequent* to the meeting at Shiloh). 1 Sam. ix. 15 (notice the *crucial* significance of יום אחד). xxv. 21 (David's thoughts *before* meeting Abigail). xxviii. 3. 2 Sam. xxiv. 11. 1 Kings xiv. 5. xxii. 31. 2 Kings vii. 17. ix. 16 *b* (obviously prior to Jehu's arrival), 30: in each of these passages, by avoiding כִּי, the writer *cuts the connection* with the immediately preceding narrative, and so suggests a plupf.[1] And in the second place, the instances in which כִּי is even supposed to introduce a plupf. are extremely rare: and the supposition itself rests upon a most precarious basis. Kalisch, § 95. 3, cites only Gen. ii. 2. xxvi. 18. Ex. xi. 1. But Gen. ii. 2 is no instance: see Delitzsch's note, and below, § 151 *n.*: xxvi. 18 I at first imagined (from reading Rashi's note וקודם שנסע יצחק חזר וחפרן) that וישב ויחפר were the words referred to: here the supposition is quite needless, as there is no limitation in the context excluding the wells in the נחל גרר from the unfriendly operations of the Philistines; rather, from the addition אחרי מות אברהם *v.* 18, we should be led to infer that *two* sets of wells were alluded to, some which had been stopped up formerly, the others (*v.* 15) only now, in order to annoy Isaac: but the note in his *Commentary* shewed that ויסתמום is the verb intended: this, however, is simply the continuation of חפרו. Ex. xi. 1 will be considered directly. From Hitzig we obtain Is. viii. 3. xxxix. 1. Jer. xxxix. 11. Jon. ii. 4. But Is. viii. the supposition is not required: Is. xxxix. is a more than doubtful passage to appeal to: Jer. xxxix.

---

[1] In Gen. xx. 4. 1 Sam. xiv. 27 כִּי could not have been used on account of the negative: but even here it may be noticed that the same *order* of the words is observed. Compare Pusey, *Lectures on Daniel*, p. xix, who speaks similarly of this idiom as one 'which expresses a past time, anterior to what follows, but in no connection of time with what precedes;' the reader who refers further to p. lxxxvi (ed. 2) will find a considerable list of instances (all cases in which the verb is היה) to add to the one I have given.

belongs to § 75 *a*: and on Jon. ii. 4 Dr. Pusey (*Minor Prophets*, ad loc.) rightly corrects the Auth. Vers. thus:—'*For Thou hadst* [*didst*] *cast me into the deep.* Jonah continues to describe the extremity of peril' etc. Keil adopts the plupf. for Gen. ii. 19, comparing Judg. ii. 6 (cf. above, p. 30[1]). 1 Kings vii. 13 ff. But Judg. ii. 6 is an uncertain passage to rely upon: the verse itself is a repetition of Josh. xxiv. 28, where it agrees perfectly with the context; see also the *Speaker's Comm.* ii. 124 (8). On 1 Kings vii. see further on. Gen. ii. 19 even Delitzsch rejects, though allowing that the plupf. rendering is possible, and citing for it Is. xxxvii. 5. Jon. ii. 4. But there is no proof that the interview mentioned in Is. xxxvii. 5 is *the same* as that in *v.* 3: the messengers may well have left the prophet in retirement for a while before *entering in*, *v.* 5, to receive his answer. And in Gen. I must confess that the plupf. seems to me quite inadmissible (for the reason quoted below on Judg. i. 8). Lastly, the two verses Is. xxxviii. 21 f. are accidentally misplaced; they evidently ought to follow *v.* 6; having been omitted by mistake, upon the error being discovered they were either at once added after Hizqiyah's song, where they now stand, or placed in the margin[2]: if the latter, the scribe who ultimately reinstated them in the text assigned them to their wrong place, which they have held ever since.

This being the state of the case, the reader may judge with what amazement I read the following note by Canon Cook in the *Speaker's Commentary* on Ex. xi. 1 ויאמר יהוה:—'. . . Thus Aben-Ezra, who proposes the rendering "had said," which is adopted by Rosenmüller, Keil, Kalisch, Ranke, Smith ("Pentateuch," pp. 557–560), who completely disposes of the objections of German and English critics. No grammatical objection is made to this construction, which is common in the Old Testament, and belongs to the simple and inartificial style of the Pentateuch.' Upon reading this, I at once consulted Smith, expecting to find the opinion I had formed crushed beneath the resistless weight of three pages of adverse instances. To my disappointment and surprise I found none of the examples I knew of appealed to (not even Gen. ii. 19), but (p. 113 being referred to) Judg. i. 8; Ex. xii. 1, cf. xi. 4 and xii. 3; xviii. 2, cf. 1;

[2] Misplacements from this cause are of well-known and common occurrence in MSS.: cf. Munro's *Lucretius*, i. p. 31.

1 Chron. xxi. 6, cf. 5; 2 Sam. v. 8, cf. 7. All in this singularly meagre list break down. Judg. i. 8 the Bishop of Bath and Wells disallows, remarking with perfect truth that 'there is nothing in the original to suggest or justify such a change of tense' (*had fought* for וילחמו): and in the two places from Exodus[1], I cannot understand upon what ground a plupf. is desiderated at all. One passage alone (which ought not to have been quoted in such a manner as to look like two) remains: 1 Chron. xxi. 6 (= 2 Sam. v. 8). This, it will be seen, is quite different from Ex. xi. 1. 2 Sam. v. 7 the writer mentions the capture of Sion: in the next verse he goes on to describe a detail connected with it: two circumstances thus intimately associated in the mind might naturally be joined together by כִּי. The case is similar with 1 Kings vii. 13 (quoted by Keil): the description of the whole building is followed by an account of the part taken in its erection by Hiram[2]. In fact, these passages are exactly parallel to those quoted above, § 75 *a*, and are to be explained in the same way: they are essentially of the nature of an *appendix to what precedes*, not an *introduction to what follows:* the use of כִּי therefore becomes at once intelligible. But Gen. ii. 19, as understood by Keil, and Ex. xi. 1, as understood by Canon Cook, are distinctly the latter: both ויצר and ויאמר are interpreted as though *wholly out of relation* with what immediately precedes them; they do not (like the instances in § 75 *a*), annex the description of some *circumstantial detail* which the writer has been unable to include in a preceding *general* statement, for the simple reason that no such general statement exists for the details to be annexed to. But when a Hebrew writer wishes to explain or prepare the way for what is to follow by the mention of some fact which *lies outside* the main course of his narrative, the instances quoted at the beginning of this note seem to shew conclusively that he *purposely disconnects* it with what precedes, by the choice of a construction not suggestive of chronological sequence, which, in these two cases, would have given us respectively ויהוה אלהים יצר and ויהוה אמר.

---

[1] In xviii. 2 ויקח (cf. Gen. xii. 5 etc.) refers naturally to Jethro's action in *taking* Zipporah for the purpose mentioned *v.* 5: to *take in* in the sense of *receive, entertain* is אסף not לקח.

[2] 1 Kings xi. 15 ויהי is the continuation of 14 *b:* cf. 1 Sam. xxv. 2.

The argument as a whole may be summarized thus. On the one hand, the instances in which ·ן is said to introduce a plupf. are at once rare and precarious: on the other, the idiom by which a *genuine* plupf. is denoted is both frequent and clearly established. Besides this, the ·ן can with difficulty be reconciled with the idea of a real plupf., while the other idiom just breaks up that element in the construction which excludes it. Under these circumstances we shall hardly be wrong in declining to endorse the opinion that the plupf. sense of ·ן is 'common in the Old Testament,' or even that 'the genius of the language permits it:' we shall more probably be right in discarding it altogether[1]. I must apologize for the length of this note: it will not, however, have been useless if it teach only a single lesson, viz. the need and the value of *verifying references*.

77. So much for the logical relation subsisting between the two ideas connected by ·ן: we must now consider the nature of the fresh action which is thus introduced.

Most commonly, and especially in the historical books, as in the passage Gen. iv. 8 cited above, the fresh action both developes and finishes in the past. But it may likewise so happen that the action is of such a character that while itself starting or developing in the past, its results continue into the present—terminating there or not, as the case may be: or, thirdly, the action may originate wholly in the present. Future time is *never*

---

[1] It may be noticed that in all the passages § 75 *a*, not only does the simple aorist afford a natural and intelligent sense, but any other rendering sounds unnatural and awkward. A translation such as 'And David took the stronghold of Sion: the same is the city of David. *And David had said* in that day' etc. stands self-condemned. Let the reader, then, beware of any interpretation which helps out the sense of a ·ן by inserting the words 'or *had*:' the variation foists in a meaning which none of the parallels quoted will warrant or even permit.

expressed by ·וְ, except where the prophetic perfect has preceded, or where the principle involved in it is really present.

78. It will hardly be necessary to cite instances in which the new action lies wholly in the past. Notice must, however, here be taken of a construction which is of constant occurrence in the historical books of the Old Testament. When the Hebrew writers have occasion in the course of their narrative to insert a clause specifying the date etc. of an action, instead of introducing it abruptly, they are in the habit of (so to speak) preparing the way for it by the use of the formula וַיְהִי *and it was* or *came to pass*. Thus instead of writing וּבָעֵת הַהִוא אָמַר אֲבִימֶלֶךְ, a Hebrew writer generally[1] prefers to say וַיְהִי בָּעֵת הַהִוא וַיֹּאמֶר א׳ *and it came to pass*, at that time, *and* or *that* Abimelech said etc., Gen. xxi. 22. And this construction is almost invariably employed with subordinate temporal or adverbial clauses introduced by כְּ or בְּ (followed by a word expressive of time, or an infinitive), by אַחַר or אַחֲרֵי, by כִּי or כַּאֲשֶׁר, by לְעֵת (as 2 Sam. xi. 2, cf. xi. 1 etc.) or מִן (as Gen. iv. 3. xli. 1. Ex. xviii. 13) etc. The sentence is not, however, always resumed by ·וְ as in the instances quoted, though this is the most frequent form: the ו may be omitted, or be separated from the verb, and then the perfect will reappear. Thus the main sentence may be resumed (1) by the perfect alone, as Gen. xl. 1. Ex. xii. 41 *b*, 51. xvi. 22. Deut. i. 3. ix. 11. Is. vii. 1. Jer. xxxvi. 1, 16. Ezek. i. 1 etc., or, though more rarely, by the impf.[2] if the sense

---

[1] Less frequently in the later books.

[2] This, when a frequentative, is more usually preceded by וְהָיָה; see Chap. VIII.

be suitable, Judg. xi. 40. 1 Kings xiv. 28. 2 Kings iv. 8. Jer. xxxvi. 23: cf. 1 Kings ix. 10 f. Or (2) by וְהִנֵּה as Gen. xv. 17. xxix. 25. xlii. 35. 1 Sam. xiii. 10 al.: cf. Gen. xxiv. 15. Or (3) by וְ with the subject before the verb, as Gen. vii. 10. xxii. 1. Ex. xii. 29. xxxiv. 29. Josh. ii. 5. vi. 8. x. 11. 1 Sam. xviii. 1. xxx. 1. 2 Sam. iii. 6. xiii. 30 al.: cf. Gen. xli. 1[1].

But (1) with וְ and (3) without וְ are both extremely rare: 2 Chron. xxiv. 11 (where, however, וּבָא is frequentative: see Chap. VIII). Ezek. ix. 8. 1 Sam. xxiii. 6 (corrupt). Is. xxii. 7.

79. We may now pass to those cases in which the action, or its results, continues into the writer's present: here, as with the perfect in the parallel instances, it is often best to translate by a present. Thus Gen. xxxii. 5 *b* וָאֵחַר. Ex. iv. 23 וָאֹמַר *and I say* (*have said*, in the immediate past), let my son go, וַתְּמָאֵן *and thou refusest* (or hast refused) to let him go[2]. Num. xxii. 11. Josh. iv. 9. 1 Kings viii. 8 *b*. xix. 10 *and* I alone *am left, and they seek* (have sought and continue seeking) my life to take it away. Is. iii. 16. xxx. 12. xli. 5 *b*. l. 7. lix. 15 *is* or *has become* missing. Hab. i. 3 ויהי. iii. 19. Mal. iii. 15. Ps. xxxv. 21. xxxviii. 13 (have laid and continue to lay snares). lii. 9.

---

[1] It may, perhaps, be thought that in these cases the clause beginning by the perfect or וְ is rather a subordinate circumstantial clause (see Appendix I), and that the real continuation of ויהי is afforded by the וַ- following. This is possible: but in some of the instances quoted such a supposition is precluded by the fact that no וַ- exists, and in others the clause itself has not the appearance of being subordinate, or can only be treated as such artificially.

[2] With this sentence as a whole, cf. Jer. xxiii. 2. xxxiv. 17.

lv. 6. cxix. 90 *and it abideth.* Ps. cxliv. 3. Job xi. 3 f. xxx. 11 f. vii. 14 *and* (so) my soul *preferreth* suffocation. xiv. 17. Gen. xix. 9 this one entered to sojourn (here), וַיִּשְׁפֹּט שָׁפוֹט *and goes on to* play the judge amidst us! xxxi. 15. 2 Sam. iii. 8. Job x. 8 וַתְּבַלְּעֵנִי *and* (yet) thou goest on to swallow me up.

Even where the event spoken of has not actually been accomplished, Jer. xxxviii. 9 *and he is going on to die* (we might have expected וּמֵת, cf. Gen. xx. 11: but 'Ebed-melekh sees Jeremiah on the very road to death). Job ii. 3 *and* thou *art enticing* me. Ps. xxix. 10 Yahweh sat at the deluge וַיֵּשֶׁב *and* Yahweh *sitteth on* (from that moment *went on* and *continues* sitting) a king for ever (not *shall* or *will* sit, which would break the continuity existing in the writer's mind between the two actions described: moreover, the future would, according to uniform usage, have been only expressed by וַיֵּשַׁב, or at least וְיֵשֵׁב. The addition of לעולם does not necessitate our rendering by the future any more than in the cases where it occurs with a *perfect*, Ps. x. 11. lxxiv. 1). Amos i. 11 (similarly with לָעַד). 1 Chron. xxiii. 25 *and dwelleth* in Jerusalem for ever. Ps. xli. 13 וַתַּצִּיבֵנִי לְפָנֶיךָ לְעוֹלָם.

80. In continuation of the *present*, as expressive of a general truth, whether this be denoted in the original by a perfect, § 12, an imperfect, §§ 32, 33, or a participle, we meet with ·ו and the impf. 1 Sam. ii. 6 Yahweh bringeth down into the Underworld, *and bringeth up*, 29. Ps. xxix. 5, 9. Is. xl. 24 he bloweth upon them *and they wither*. xliv. 12–15. lvii. 20 for it cannot rest *and* its waters *are troubled.* Hos. viii. 10. Amos vi. 9. Mic. vi. 16. Ps. xxxiv. 8 the angel of Yahweh encampeth (partcp.) . . . *and delivereth them.* xlix. 15 death feedeth on them (impf.) וַיִּרְדּוּ *and* the

righteous *rule* over them. lxv. 9 *and* (so) *they are afraid.* xc. 3, 10 *b.* xcii. 8. xciv. 7. Prov. xi. 2 pride cometh וַיָּבֹא *and* humiliation *cometh* (i. e. follows quickly after it), 8. xx. 26. xxv. 4. Job vi. 20. vii. 9 a cloud cometh to an end *and vanisheth*, 18. xiv. 2, 10, 20. xx. 15. xxiii. 13 his soul desireth *and doeth.* xxiv. 2, 11, 20. xii. 22–25. xxxiv. 24. xxxvii. 8. xxxix. 15. xxxvi. 7.

After a pure present, Is. ii. 7. Job iv. 5 now it cometh to thee *and* thou *art* overcome. 2 Sam. xix. 2 בּוֹכֶה וַיִּתְאַבֵּל is weeping *and mourning.* Jer. vi. 14. Ps. xcii. 11 f. xxix. 9. cxliv. 3 what is man וַתֵּדָעֵהוּ *and* (yet) thou knowest him? Is. li. 12.

81. In the description of future events, the impf. with וַ is used upon exactly the same principle as the perfect, i.e. it represents them as simple matters of history. There are two cases to be distinguished: (1) where the impf. is preceded by the prophetic perfect itself, (2) where it is not so preceded.

(1) Little need be said in explanation of the first. Just as elsewhere the impf. with וַ marks a continuation of the preceding tense, so here, too, it is employed if a writer desires to pourtray a future scene or series of events, as though they were unfolding themselves before his eyes, in the manner of ordinary historical occurrences. For one or two reasons, however, the impf. is not by any means so frequent in this sense as the perfect: the prophets generally either prefer, after beginning with an emphatic perfect, to break off into the proper future form, or else they omit וַ altogether, or separate it from the verb in such a manner as to make it impossible for the impf. in this form to appear. Is. v. 15 f. (after pf. 14), 25. ix. 1 ff. 5 unto us a son is given וַתְּהִי *and* the govern-

ment *is* upon his shoulder, *and* his name *has been* (or *is*—past extending into present, § 79) called etc. It is quite wrong, with the Auth. Vers., to change the tense in the middle of the verse, to say *and* the government *shall be* etc.: Isaiah might certainly have written so, had he chosen, but then we should have read וְהִיתָה not וַתְּהִי, וְקָרָא (or וַיִּקְרָא) not וַיִּקְרָא. If it is allowable to say *have seen* a great light, *is born*, *is given*, it is equally allowable to continue in the same tenses; it is absolutely indefensible to introduce an arbitrary alteration in the course of the verse, and to substitute for the ideal stand-point of the writer, *which we have already accepted* in the previous perfects, a real stand-point of our own. Isaiah himself does not employ the future till 6 *b* תעשה: and the translator will do best to follow his example. ix. 17–20. xxiv. 6. xxxi. 2. xlviii. 21 f. he hath redeemed Ja'qob . . . ויבקע *and hath cleft* the rock (here the Auth. Vers. rightly retains the pf.). liii. 2, 9. Joel ii. 23. Mic. ii. 13. Ps. xxii. 30 all the fat of the earth *have eaten and worshipped* ('*shall* eat and worship' Auth. Vers., which would be יאכלו והשתחוו, or in the slightly more energetic poetical form יאכלו וְישתחוו, exactly as *v.* 27: cf. also Hos. iv. 10).

82. (ב) We have seen, § 14 γ, how the prophetic perfect may be suddenly introduced by a Hebrew writer after a succession of tenses thoroughly alien to it in import. In all the examples quoted, however, the conjunction was either absent, or separated from the verb by one or more intervening words. Supposing, however, that the writer wishes to adopt the principle of the proph. perf., but at the same time to connect his fresh verb by ו immediately with what precedes, without any intervening words, in

what way can he do this? If he still retains the perfect tense, this, being now united with וְ, will by Hebrew usage throw the event to be described into the future, a result which *ex hypothesi* he desires to avoid: the same result would follow from the use of the imperfect and וְ: clearly, then (unless he chooses to adopt the exceptional construction of the inf. abs.), nothing remains for him but to employ the imperfect with וַ in order to express his meaning. And the use of this וַ has the additional advantage of representing the event, in a manner often extremely appropriate, not merely with the certainty of the prophetic perfect, but as *flowing* naturally *out of*, being an *immediate consequence* of, the situation described in the preceding sentences. It is under circumstances like these, when the transition to the new stand-point in the future is made for the first time, not by a pf. but by the impf. with וַ, that we are most apt to find this tense translated by a *future*: unless this be done solely for the sake of the English idiom, in which the force of the perfect might not always be clear, it is a gross error, which sometimes (as will directly appear) may involve one grosser still, that, viz., of rendering a perfect by a future!

Occasionally, it may be observed, as in a parallel case alluded to on p. 17, it remains uncertain whether the writer is describing a scene of his own experience, or one which belongs really to the future.

Is. ii. 9 *and* (so) the mean man *is bowed down, and* the great man *humbled* (the consequences of 8 really appertaining to the future, described as though the reality belonged to the past: *in themselves* the words might describe a continuance of 8, in the past or present; that,

however, this is not the case is shewn by a comparison of 11 and 17, as well as by the sense of the whole passage 12–21: cf. further v. 15 f., where *after* the וַ֫ we have the *perfect* itself נקדש). ix. 10–15. xxii. 1–12 (note 8, 12 וַ֫ with ביום ההוא). Ezek. xxviii. 16 *b* (in the קִינָה upon the king of Ṣor: *v.* 17, where there is no ו, we have the pf. השלכתיך). Jer. iv. 16 they are coming, *and see they have* uttered (the addition of *see* makes the sense clearer in English: observe 17 the pf. היו); perhaps Hab. i. 9, 10. Ps. lxiv. 8–10 (most prob.) *and* (so) God *hath shot* at them etc., where observe that even if, in the teeth of all grammatical analogy, we render וַיֹּרֵם *and he shall shoot* them, the difficulty is only deferred, not surmounted: the next verb היו is an unmistakeable perfect, shewing incontrovertibly that, like itself, the preceding וירם must be referred to either an ideal or an actual past. And the perfect in the second half of the verse shews further how futile and nugatory it would be to discard the Masoretic punctuation, and to read וְיֹרֵם: the symmetry of the verse would be spoilt, הָיוּ would remain as obstinate as ever, and the peculiar appropriateness of וַיֹּרֵם indicating the events 8–10 as the consequences inevitably arising out of the conduct previously described, would be lost. The same remarks will apply to *v.* 10, and to xciv. 23.

Obs. Some passages in which וַ֫ has the *appearance* of being future, although not so in reality:—Ps. l. 6 (וַ֫ is the legitimate continuation of the pff. 1, 2, 3 *c*)[1]. lv. 18 *b* (either a conviction as to the future like Ps. lxiv. 8, or an allusion to the past: in either case וַ֫ is in strict con-

[1] It is noticeable that in Ps. xcvii, the opening verses of which are clearly imitated from Ps. l, we have, *v.* 6, the *perfect* הִגִּידוּ in exact correspondence to the ויגידו here.

formity with the pff. 19, and must stand or fall with them). lxxvii. 7 *c* (*a*, *b* reflect the agitation of the writer: *c* indicates the result flowing from it *and so my spirit enquires*). xcii. 11 f. (a consequence of what has been stated: *and so my horn is exalted*).

83. We know from § 27 (*a*) that the impf. can be employed by itself to describe single events occurring in past time. The instances there quoted were restricted to those in which the copulative *and* could have found no place, the verb being disconnected in sense with the preceding words: we must now consider those cases of a somewhat different nature, by no means uncommon in an elevated or poetical style, in which the writer, instead of adopting the usual prosaic construction of the impf. with וְ, makes use of the impf. alone, or merely attaches it to what precedes by the simple *waw* וַ (which the reader need not be reminded must be scrupulously discriminated from וְ). The ordinary mode of smooth progression being thus abandoned, the action introduced in the manner described is, on the one hand, cut off from the previous portions of the sentence, and rendered independent, while, on the other hand, it is depicted with all the vividness and force which are characteristic of the tense, but which are disguised, or rather destroyed, when it is in combination with וְ. Our own language hardly affords us the means of reproducing the effect thus created: sometimes, however, the use of the *present*, or even the addition of a note of exclamation (indicating a *change of tone* in reading, expressive of a sudden or startling event), may enable us partially to do so.

In some of these cases the impf. appears in the *jussive* form, which seems to shew that we are right in regarding them as instances of וְ being actually omitted, rather than

as instances of the bare imperfect (according to § 27). Otherwise, indeed, the appearance of the jussive in pure narrative would be inexplicable.

Obs. The omission of ·וַ has been compared by Ewald to the omission of the augment in Sanskrit and Greek. The illustration is very complete: in the first place, the shorter or 'secondary' person-endings which appear after the augment were in all probability (see G. Curtius, *das Griechische Verbum seinem Baue nach dargestellt*, i. p. 45) originally produced through the influence of this prefix: ἔ-δίδω-ν (Sk. *á-dadā-m*), ἔ-φερε (*á-bhara-t*) differ in no essential element from δίδω-μι (*dadā-mi*), φέρει (*bhára-ti*), except in the presence of the accented demonstrative prefix which was employed in order to throw the action into the past, and the weight of which caused a compensatory change to take place in the termination. And in the same way וַתָּשֶׁת etc. seem clearly to have arisen. But, in the second place, when this change had become fixed in language, the altered termination became as characteristic of past time, as the augment itself: it thus *acquired* a significance which primarily, as we just saw, belonged exclusively to the latter; and so the augment, at one time essential and indispensable, could be dropped (in poetry) without detriment to the sense. And upon the same principle, it would seem, we meet with יָקֻם, יָשֶׁת etc., the altered ultima suggesting past time as unmistakeably as if the ·וַ itself had been also present. But it does not appear legitimate to have recourse to this explanation in those passages where (as Ps. lviii. 5) the context does not *immediately suggest* to the reader that the conjunction has been omitted, or where a prose writer could not have employed it. To do so would be to presuppose that a Hebrew author used a form which (whatever the cause) has a *double* meaning, under circumstances where, so far from there being anything either to intimate the sense in which it is to be taken, or to justify his putting such a sense upon it, the reader's natural impulse would be to impose upon it the meaning which was not intended.

84. We find accordingly—

(*a*) with ֭: Is. x. 13. xliii. 28[1] (but cf. Delitzsch). xlviii.

[1] Cohortative form.

3. li. 2 *b* as a single man did I call him, *and* I blest him, *and* I multiplied him! lvii. 17. lxiii. 3–6[1]. Hab. iii. 5. Ps. xviii. 38 (2 Sam. xxii. וְ), 43, 46. civ. 32 *b* (or *that*, § 63). cvii. 27. Job xxix. 21, 25 (freq.); and apparently also the following:—Is. lxiii. 3[2] וַיָּז. Prov. xv. 25[2]. Job xiii. 27[2]. xv. 33[2]. xxiv. 25[2]. xxvii. 22[2]. Hos. xi. 4[2]? It is, however, very singular that, though the tense is in the abbreviated form, the conjunction, which is still retained, should, nevertheless, be pointed וְ rather than וַ: either וַיַּצֵּב or וַיַּצִּיב, for example, would have been at once intelligible, and would not have occasioned the surprise we undoubtedly experience at meeting וַיַּצֵּב. The latter form, at least upon this explanation, seems indeed, in my opinion, to continue enigmatical and strange.

(β) without וְ: Hos. vi. 1[2] יָקֶם. Hab. iii. 16 יבוא. Ps. viii. 7 *a* hast made him rule (cf. *b*, and 6 וַתְּ). xi. 6[2]? xviii. 7 (2 Sam. xxii. וַ), 12[2] (2 Sam. וַ), 14 (2 Sam.), 16 (2 Sam.), 17, 18, 20, 21 *a*, 37, 38 (2 Sam.[3] ארדפה followed by וְ), 39 (2 Sam. וְ), 40 *b*, 42, 44 (2 Sam. וַ). xxv. 9[2]. xliv. 3, 11–15. xlvii. 4[2]. lii. 9. lxiv. 9. lxviii. 11. lxxviii. 15 etc., 26[2]. lxxx. 9, 12. lxxxi. 8. xc. 3[2]. civ. 32. cvi. 12 etc. cvii. 14, 20, 26, 27, 29[2], 33[2], 35[2]. cxxxix. 13. Prov. vii. 7[3] אבינה. Job xviii. 9[2], 12[2]. xxxiii. 27[2]. xxxvii. 5. xxxviii. 24[2].

And immediately after a pf., in which case the bare

---

[1] In Is. xii. 1, which is commonly quoted as another instance, the verbs may be strictly jussive (cf. Ps. lxxxv. 5 with 2–4, and cxxvi. 4 with 1–3): and in l. 2 תנאש and וְתָמֹת may well be dependent on the preceding אשים, the jussive being then employed in accordance with the regular custom; see § 64 *Obs.*

[2] Jussive forms. For a further consideration of some of these passages, see App. II.

[3] Cohortative forms; cf. above, §§ 54, 70.

impf. indicates the rapid or instantaneous manner in which the second action is conceived as following the first:— Ex. xv. 12, 14. Hos. ix. 6 (almost a hypothetical clause, after הנה). Hab. iii. 10. Ps. xxxvii. 14 f. xlvi. 7. lxvi. 6. lxviii. 11. lxix. 33. lxxiv. 14. lxxvii. 17. xc. 5. civ. 6. Job xxiii. 10 *b*. xxiv. 24.

85. In prose where, for variety or emphasis, a verb which would naturally be connected with the foregoing narrative by וְ, is preceded by its subject or object, or in any other way separated from the copulative, the tense which then appears is almost always the perfect. Thus Gen. i. 5 we first have וַיִּקְרָא, but so soon as for the sake of contrast the order is changed, we find the perfect וְלַחֹשֶׁךְ קָרָא: this is constantly the case, *v.* 10. iii. 3, 17. iv. 1, 2, 4, 18, 22. vi. 8. vii. 19. viii. 5, 14. ix. 23 etc. 2 Sam. ii. 3. iii. 22. iv. 12; or without any וְ, Gen. i. 27. iii. 16.

Poetry, however, in cases like these usually prefers the imperfect as the means of presenting the livelier image: not, of course, that the imperfect ever 'stands for' the perfect, or assumes its meaning (!), but the poet takes the opportunity thus offered of conferring brilliancy and variety upon his description, the legitimate signification of the tense chosen, whether as an inceptive or as a frequentative, being always distinctly traceable. E. g. Is. ii. 6. Hab. iii. 16, 19; often in the historical Psalms, as xviii. 8 וירגזו . . . ו, 9 תאכל . . . ו, 14 etc. xxiv. 2. l. 19. lxxviii. 20 *and* torrents *overflowed*, 29 etc. lxxxi. 7, 13. civ. 6–9. cvii. 6 etc. Prov. vii. 21 *b*. Job iv. 12, 15. x. 10, 11.

Obs. It is apparently maintained by some scholars (see Hitzig on Jer. xliv. 22. Ps. xxvii. 10. xliv. 10, and compare Ewald, § 346 *b*) that these and certain similar passages present examples of what may be termed a dissolution or disintegration of the construction with waw

conversive—the verb, after its separation from ו, being permitted to remain in the imperfect without any special significance being attached to it[1]. That a tense should thus lose its usual force appears a singular conclusion to arrive at: and yet, if this be not the one intended, such a remark as that 'though separated by the negation from the waw, the impf. still remains and is not changed into the pf.,' seems nugatory and needless. No fact about the Hebrew language is more evident than the *practical equivalence* of ויקרא and ו . . . קרא: these are the two alternative formulae which in countless passages interchange with one another: the peculiar point of view which determined the selection of the construction with ו־ (even if then always consciously preserved) was entirely dropped when the verb parted company with its conjunction. In the *comparatively* few[2] cases, therefore, where instead of ו . . . קרא we find the formula ו . . . יקרא, it is fair to conclude that the writers had some special object in selecting the unusual tense: even in poetry, if we find *x* used where a prose writer would have employed *y*, we cannot assume the two to be identical, but must suppose that the choice of the one in preference to the other rested upon some particular ground, such as that suggested in the text.

Another theory to account for the presence of an unexpected imperfect, no less fanciful and inadmissible than the opinion just criticized, may be found in Hitzig's note on Ps. xxxii. 5.

---

[1] Hitzig appeals to Deut. ii. 12. Josh. xv. 63. 1 Sam. xxvii. 4. 2 Sam. xv. 37. 1 Kings xx. 33. Is. xl. 14. xli. 6. Jer. lii. 7. Job iii. 25. Cant. iii. 4. But in all these places the impf. possesses a marked significance according to §§ 27, 30, where, indeed, several of the passages have been already cited.

[2] Even after a little word like לא it is extremely rare to find the impf.; against nearly fifty cases of ולא שמע and ולא שמעו, there is but one of ולא ישמעו (in past time, of course), viz. 1 Sam. ii. 25.

CHAPTER VII.

Accents.

86. It was remarked incidentally § 69 that when the imperfect was preceded by ·ל a retrocession of tone frequently took place: beyond endeavouring, however, to assign a cause for this phenomenon, we did not pause to examine the laws by which it is governed, or to lay down rules by which the place of the tone might be ascertained. In the construction which will have to be explained in the next chapter, that, namely, of the *perfect* with waw conversive, a change takes place (if circumstances permit it) in the *opposite* direction, the tone, if ordinarily upon the penultima, being *thrown forward* on to the ultima: this alteration forms such a noticeable and striking feature, and is, moreover, of such extreme importance as an index to the meaning intended to be borne by the tense, that the rules by which it is determined must be carefully stated and ought to be thoroughly understood and mastered by the reader. For this purpose it will be necessary to refer briefly to the nature of the *accents* in Hebrew, and to the principles upon which the use made of them depends[1].

---

[1] The English reader is advised, with reference to what follows, to consult Gesenius, §§ 15, 16, 29, or, still better, Kalisch, pt. 1, §§ 10–13 with the corresponding sections in pt. ii, viz. §§ x–xiii.

87. The student will be aware that in Hebrew the accents serve two purposes: by their disposition in a given verse, they indicate the subdivisions, whatever their number, into which it naturally falls when recited by an intelligent reader; these subdivisions, determined as they obviously are by the sense of the passage, will on the one hand correspond with our *stops*—so far, at least, as the latter go (for they are by no means so numerous as the Hebrew accents): on the other hand, inasmuch as in every sentence when spoken, unless it is intentionally delivered in a monotone, the voice rises or falls in accordance with the meaning, they will clearly be equally well adapted to mark the changes in the modulation of the voice during chanting or solemn recitation. It is in their first character, as grammatical or syntactical symbols, that we have here to regard them.

88. The principles regulating accentuation—of which, as is well known, there are two different systems, one applied in the prose books of the Old Testament, the other in the three (specially) poetical books, Psalms, Proverbs, Job (the dialogue parts, from iii. 2 to xlii. 6)—are highly complicated and abstruse. For practical purposes, however, a few simple rules will be found amply sufficient; and those who will take the trouble to acquaint themselves with no more than what is stated in Kalisch, or even with the briefer and, of course, only provisional exposition which will be given here, may be assured that they will reap no small advantage from the study[1].

---

[1] I trust that the purport of this chapter will not be misunderstood. Some acquaintance with accents is indispensable to the Hebrew student: not only for the single object, with a view to which this account of them has been inserted here, but upon other.

89. The presence of waw conversive is often marked by a change of the tone-syllable: our first question, then, will be, How can the tone-syllable be ascertained?

The answer is very simple: with one or two exceptions it will be found that in every word provided with an accent, *the accent marks the tone-syllable.*

Without, therefore, as yet even knowing the *name* of the accents employed, we at once see that in וְכָפַרְתָּ Gen. vi. 14, ואֹסַפְתָּ 21, והִקַּמֹתִי ix. 11, וְזָכַרְתִּי 15[1], the waw is conversive: contrast ix. 17 הֲקִמֹתִי, Qoh. ii. 15 ואֹמַרתִּי *and I said* (for which the older language would, of course, use וְאֹמַר). viii. 15 וּשׁבַחתִּי.

90. Some of the accents, however, have the peculiarity

---

and more general grounds as well: they frequently offer material assistance in unravelling the sense of a difficult passage; the best authorities continually appeal to them, so much so indeed, that to a person who remains entirely ignorant of their nature and use, many of the notes in modern commentaries must remain unintelligible. It is very far from being my intention to offer a complete dissertation upon accents (a task for which I am in no sense qualified), still less to discourage or seem to supersede a more extended study: my design in writing this chapter is simply to smooth the way for those who may be induced to pursue the subject more thoroughly afterwards, or, for such as have not the time or inclination to do this, to lay down a few broad rules which they may find of practical service.

[1] The *metheg* (i. e. *bridle*) in these words is added in order to support or *hold back* the voice from hurrying onwards and so shortening the ante-penultima unduly (as in וְזָרַחְתָּם). In any word the second syllable before that on which the principal tone rests will be felt to have a secondary accent or *counter-tone* (e. g. con'demna'tion, cor'respond'): in Hebrew, when this is an *open* syllable, the counter-tone is marked by *metheg* (Gen. xx. 5 אָמַר־לִי. וְהִיא־גַם־הִיא, but בְּתָם־לבָבִי without it), or, occasionally, by some other accent which fills its place (viii. 19 למִשׁפְחֹתֵיהֶם).

of being always affixed to the *first* or the *last* letter of a word, whether it begin a tone-syllable or not: these are called respectively *prepositives* and *postpositives.* When these occur, the reader can only determine where the tone really lies from his knowledge of the language: but he will not be unnecessarily misled by them, because the other accents (which *do* mark the tone) are always placed above or below the *first consonant* of the syllable to which they refer, and *immediately to the left* of the vowel-point (if the consonant in question have one in such a position that the accent might clash with it), whereas the *pre-* and *postpositives* always stand on the *extreme right* or *left* respectively of the word to which they belong.

Thus no one can doubt that in עֶשֶׂב Gen. i. 11, דֶּשֶׁא 12, בְּלִבְבְכֶם Ps. iv. 5 we have instances of prepositives (contrast בֵּין Gen. i. 7. וְהִיוּ i. 15); or that in הָאָדָם ii. 23. אֱלֹהִים i. 7. לָאוֹר i. 5. וַיִּקְרָא ix. 23. כְּעֵץ Ps. i. 3 we have before us postpositives (contrast שֹׁרְצוֹ Gen. i. 21: though similar in form, the difference of position is enough to discriminate the accent here from that upon לָאוֹר i. 5: compare, too, אֲשֶׁר ii. 19 with אֲשֶׁר i. 7).

Whenever, then, an accent appears on the *extreme* right or left of a word, it cannot be regarded as an index of the tone-syllable: of course it *may* mark it (though even then it will not be in its proper position, as regards the *whole* syllable, for so doing), but it will do it only accidentally.

91. There are only eight pre- and postpositives: some of the latter, however, when they are attached to words accented on the penultima (*mil'el*) are written twice—on the ultima as being postpositive, on the penultima to mark

the actual tone of the word. This is always the case with *pashṭa*, an accent which from this circumstance catches the eye very frequently: as Gen. i. 1 תֹהוּ, 7 הַמַּיִם, 9, 11, 12 etc.: and in Baer and Delitzsch's edition of Genesis (Lipsiae 1869), and of Isaiah (1872), the same duplication is adopted with the other postpositives[1] as well, 'ut omnis dubitatio, utrum hoc illudve vocabulum milel sit an milra, praecaveretur' (praef. p. vii); see i. 7. אֶת־הָרָקִיעַ. ii. 23 וַיֹּאמֶר. iii. 17. xiii. 1 וַיַּעַל. Is. xxxvi. 6. xxxvii. 24 etc. Thus where we find the *same* accent repeated upon one word we may know that *the tone is on the penultima*[2].

92. On the other hand where (for reasons which need not be here discussed) two *different* accents appear attached to one word, *the tone is indicated by the second*[3]. Thus Gen. xvii. 24 וְאַבְרָהָם, 25. xix. 27 אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם; Ps. i. 1 רְשָׁעִים, 2 חָפְצוֹ, 3, 4 אִם־כַּמֹּץ (tone indicated by the point over מ *above* the cholem). ii. 2 עַל־יהוה. iii. 8 קוֹמָה. iv. 9 לַבָּטַח.

93. These short and simple rules will be found fully sufficient for the purpose of ascertaining on what syllable in a given case the tone lies: we must next consider some of the *general* principles of accentuation, from which it

---

[1] And likewise with *telisha magnum* among the prepositives, e.g. vii. 2 אֲשֶׁר. xxvii. 46; Is. xxxvi. 11 אֱלֹהִים etc.

[2] This rule is valid for all ordinary editions of the Hebrew text (in which, indeed, its application is limited to the single case of *pashṭa*): the reader who uses Baer and Delitzsch may easily modify it as follows:—Where a *postpositive* accent is repeated, the tone is marked by the *first* accent; where a *prepositive* is repeated, the tone is marked by the *second* accent.

[3] Except in the rare case of 'incomplete retrocession,' Kal. ii. xi. 5.

results as *particular* instances that the tone after *waw conversive* in the perfect, in certain cases, is not thrown forward on to the ultima. The regular form for *and I will kill* is וקטלתי *wᵉqáṭaltí*, the double beat being as distinctly marked as in the English words *per'severé*, *cor'respond'*: but under certain conditions we find וקָטַלתי *wᵉqaṭálti* with the same meaning: and the nature of these conditions must be here examined[1].

94. Hebrew accents are of two kinds. The first kind, called *distinctive* accents, correspond roughly to modern *stops*, and, like the latter, indicate the breaks or divisions in a sentence required by the meaning: they are, however, more numerous than our stops, because they measure with greater minuteness the precise length of each break, and because they mark further those slighter and sometimes hardly perceptible pauses which in most languages are regulated by the voice alone. The other kind, termed *conjunctive* accents, are peculiar to Hebrew: they shew, generally, that the word to which one of them is attached is closely connected in sense with that which immediately follows it: in English this would only be denoted by a smooth and unbroken pronunciation.

95. For our present purpose it is the distinctive accents which possess the greatest interest: it will be accordingly worth while to specify the more important among them, i. e. those which mark some considerable break in the sense, and which, therefore, in translation will commonly be represented by a stop.

---

[1] The tone likewise remains upon the penultima in particular forms of the *weak* verb: but as the rules for the cases in which this occurs are wholly independent of accentual considerations, they will not be stated till the next chapter.

96. Firstly, in the *prose* books:—

The end of a verse is always indicated by the perpendicular line called *sillûq*, followed by *sôph-pâsûq* (: 'end of the verse'): thus Gen. i. 4 :הַחֹשֶׁךְ (the *sillûq* on the tone-syllable according to rule, חשך being a segolate noun, and consequently *mil'el*).

Every verse (except a few, and these generally short ones, as Gen. ii. 1, though not always, as Deut. v. 23. vi. 22) is divided into two parts—but by no means necessarily *equal* parts, see e. g. Gen. i. 11. ii. 19. vii. 21. Lev. viii. 19—by *athnach:* this marks the principal pause in the whole verse. Thus Gen. i. 1 אֱלֹהִים. ii. 17 מִמֶּנּוּ.

Sometimes verses are divided into *three* principal parts: when this is the case, the third section is closed by *segolta* ֑, which always *precedes* athnach, Gen. i. 7, 28. ii. 23 הָאָדָם֑.

A break of somewhat shorter duration is indicated by the two perpendicular dots ֞ called *zaqef*—one of the commonest of distinctive accents—often spoken of as *zaqef-qaṭon*, to distinguish it from ֟, which is termed *zaqef-gadol:* see Gen. ii. 9 הַגָּן and וְעֵץ, 10 מֵעֵדֶן, and iii. 10 וַיֹּאמֶר.

A somewhat slighter pause is indicated by *revîa'*, as Gen. i. 2 וְהָאָרֶץ. ii. 21 וַיִּקַּח.

The last prose accent which need be considered for our present purpose is *ṭifcha*[1]: it marks a decidedly

[1] Otherwise called *ṭarcha:* and this is the name it always bears (in most editions) in the Masoretic notes, e. g. on Judg. xvii. 1, where the marginal comment upon אֶפְרָיִם is קמץ במרחא i. e. *qameṣ* with *ṭarcha.* The Masôra here calls attention to the *pausal* form of the word being generated by a *smaller* distinctive: this it does continually; see, for instance, Josh. v. 14. viii. 1. xvii. 14. xix. 50.

shorter break than any of the preceding accents, and cannot usually be reproduced, at least in our *written* language, even by a comma. Examples: Gen. ii. 7 הָאָדָם, 18 עֵזֶר.

97. Two or three verses translated with the stops or pauses indicated, will make this perfectly clear: it ought, however, to be observed that in Hebrew the various parts of a verse are proportioned out and correlated to each other somewhat differently from what might appear more natural in English.

Gen. iii. 1 now the serpent was more subtle (*zaqef*, slight pause) than any beast of the field (slight pause, in German a comma before the following relative) which the Lord God had made: (*athnach*, colon, or even full stop, as Auth. Vers.:) and he said unto the woman, (*zaqef*, comma,) Yea, hath God said, (*zaqef*,) Ye shall not eat (*zaqef*, slight pause) of every tree of the garden? 3 but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, (*segolta*, the emphatic portion of the verse marked off from what follows more decidedly than in English,) God hath said, (*revia'*, comma,) Ye shall not eat of it, (*zaqef*,) neither shall ye touch it: (*athnach*, followed, after a pause, by the reason, added emphatically and by itself:) lest ye die[1].

Judg. i. 15. v. 27. vii. 5. viii. 26 (all cases of the pausal form with *zaqef*, which is considerably more common than with *ṭarcha*).

[1] Cf. Ex. xxiii. 23, where the tripartite division of the verse, with only a single word in the third section, produces a singularly stately and effective cadence:—'For my angel will go before thee: (*segolta*, more than a comma Auth. Vers.:) and he will bring thee (*revia'*: let the voice rest for an instant after *thee* before proceeding to the three parallel couplets which follow) unto the Amorite and the Hittite, (*zaqef*,) and the Perizzite and the Cana'anite, (*zaqef*,) the Hivite and the Jebûsite: (*athnach*:) and I will destroy him!'

In *v.* 6 מפריו (comma, Auth. Vers.) we have an instance of the weaker accent *ṭifcha* exhibiting a real disjunctive force: similarly 9 לוֹ, 10 אנכי, 12 מן־העץ etc.; elsewhere its value is not equal to more than that of a slight pause in the voice, as *v.* 8 בגן, 11 אכל־ממנו.

98. Secondly, in the poetical books:—

Here, as before, *silluq* with *sôph-pâsûq* marks the end of the verse, Ps. ii. 2 :ועל־משיחו, 3 :עבתימו. The other principal divisions are indicated by *athnach* (as Ps. i. 6 צדיקים), and a compound accent called *merkha with mahpakh*, or *merkha mahpakhatum*[1], as Ps. i. 2 חפצו. iii. 6 ואשנה: this accent is always placed *before athnach*, corresponding, in this respect, to *segolta* in prose. In the poetical books *athnach* does not mark such a decided break[2] as *merkha mahp.;* the latter, accordingly, in verses consisting of only two members, is often employed by preference, to the exclusion of *athnach*[3]. The only other distinctive accents which need be noticed here are—

ṣinnor, a postpositive (to be distinguished from *ṣinnorith*, which is a *conjunctive* accent and *not* postpositive), as Ps. iii. 3 רבים. xiii. 6 בטחתי;

revia', as Ps. iv. 2 צדקי. ii. 8 ממני; often preceded by *geresh* on the same word, and then sometimes called *revia' mugrash*, as Ps. i. 1 לצים. ii. 8 ואחזתך. iv. 2 חנני; and

dechi (prepositive), as ii. 9 תרעם, 10 ועתה.

---

[1] Sometimes also (e. g. by Delitzsch) termed, from its situation *above* and *below* the word, עולה ויורד *'oleh w'yored.*

[2] See Ps. iii. 6. iv. 7, 9. xiv. 2. xxx. 10. xlv. 15 etc.

[3] E. g. Ps. i. 2. iii. 3. iv. 5. v. 7. xi. 6 etc.

Examples:—

Ps. i. 1 happy is the man (*revia'*, slight pause) who hath not walked in the counsel of the wicked, (*merkha,*) and in the way of sinners (*dechi*, slight pause) hath not stood, (*athnach,*) and in the seat of the scornful (*revia'*) hath not sat.

xxvii. 4 one thing have I asked of the Lord, (*ṣinnor,*) *it* will I seek for; (*merkha*, chief pause;) that I should dwell in the house of the Lord (*dechi*, note the dagesh in the following aspirate בּ) all the days of my life, (*athnach,*) to gaze on the pleasantness of the Lord, (*revia',*) and to meditate in his temple[1].

xl. 13 for evils have compassed me about (*ṭazer*, slighter than even *dechi,*) till they are beyond numbering; (*revia';*) my iniquities have taken hold upon me, (*dechi,*) and I cannot look up: (*athnach :*) they are more than the hairs of my head; (*revia' mugrash ;*) and my heart hath forsaken me.

99. Now there are one or two peculiarities of Hebrew usage dependent upon the position assumed by a word in a sentence, and consequently of such a nature as to be relative to, and ascertainable by, the accents with which it is provided, which materially modify the general rule that with the so-called *waw conversivum praeteriti* the tone is thrown forward on to the ultima.

100. The first of these is the dislike felt to *two accented syllables succeeding one another, unless separated by a decided*

---

[1] Observe here how accurately the accentuation reflects the sense; the two infinitives introduced by לְ, *to gaze* and *to meditate*, stand by themselves as the two co-ordinate objects of שבחי: they are accordingly marked off from the latter by means of *athnach*.

pause in pronunciation, i. e. unless the first has a distinctive accent: where this is the case, however short the pause may be, the voice has time to take rest and recover strength, so as to give proper utterance to what follows. But where such a pause cannot be made, the collision is avoided by one of two expedients, either that, namely, of *forcing back the tone* of the first word, and shortening, if necessary, the vowel in the now toneless ultima, or else by that of employing *maqqef* to throw the two words into one, so as to cause the *proper* tone of the first to disappear. Instances may readily be found: Gen. iv. 2 רֹעֵה צֹאן, 6 חָרָה לָךְ, 22 תּוּבַל קַיִן. xiii. 9 הִפָּרֶד נָא. Is. xl. 7 נִשְׁבָּה בּוֹ, 23 שֹׁפְטֵי אֶרֶץ will exemplify the first expedient; Gen. vi. 14 עֲצֵי־גֹפֶר. ix. 7 וּרְבוּ־בָהּ will exemplify the second.

Now when either of these expedients is adopted with a perfect preceded by וְ *conversive*, it is plain that the characteristic position of the tone will cease to exist.

Thus Deut. xiv. 26 וְאָכַלְתָּ שָּׁם, although in the same verse we have both ונתתה and ושמחת; Amos i. 4, 7 ושלחתי אש, but *v.* 5 ושברתי, 8 והכרתי. Lev. xxvi. 25 ושלחתי דֶבֶר, and even Deut. iv. 25 וְעָשִׂיתֶם פֶּסֶל. Ezek. xxxix. 17: in all these cases the tone has been *driven back* on to the penultima[1]. Instances of the second

[1] The rule, however, is not carried out with perfect uniformity: in a few exceptional passages the tone is permitted to remain on the ultima: e. g. Ex. xxix. 5, 43. xxx. 26. Deut. xxiii. 14 al. But in this respect the practice with regard to the perfect and ו only presents us with similar exceptions to those which meet us elsewhere: cf. Deut. vii. 25. xx. 6 al.

expedient are rarer: see Zech. ix. 10 וְהִכְרַתִּי־רֶכֶב. Ezek. xiv. 13 *b*. Is. viii. 17 וְקִוִּיתִי־לוֹ (Baer and Delitzsch).

101. The second of the peculiarities alluded to is that owing to the manner in which the voice is naturally inclined to rest on the last accented syllable before a pause, the vowel belonging to that syllable is, if possible, *lengthened* (as הַמַּיִם Gen. i. 6), or, if it be a verbal form such as שָׁמְעוּ (*milra'*), the *shwa'* is replaced by the original vowel, *to which the tone then recedes*[1], as שָׁמַעוּ (*mil'el*). Thus, for example, Gen. ii. 25 יִתְבּוֹשָׁשׁוּ. ix. 4 תֹאכֵלוּ. xxiv. 46 הִשְׁקִתָה. Is. liii. 1, 7 נֶאֱלָמָה (pf., not the participle, which is *milra'*: see i. 21, 26[2]). liv. 11 לֹא נֻחָמָה.

This is almost always the case with the two principal distinctive accents *silluq* and *athnach* (except in a very few words[3] such as מֶלֶךְ, which never change), and not unfrequently with those of smaller value, particularly *zaqef*[4], although with these the usage fluctuates.

Similarly, when a perfect with *waw conversive* stands in pause, in order, apparently, to afford the voice a more suitable resting-place than it would find if the accent were violently thrown forward to the ultima, the tone

---

[1] But this recession does not take place when the old heavy termination ון- is retained in the impf., as Ps. xii. 9.

[2] Cf. above, p. 14 note: and contrast further Num. xxi. 20 with Cant. vi. 10, 1 Kings ii. 46 with Ps. v. 10, Esth. viii. 15 שָׂמְחָה *she rejoiced* (wrongly cited in Fürst's *Concordance* as an *adjective*) with Ps. cxiii. 9 שָׂמֵחָה *rejoicing*.

[3] A list of the exceptions in Genesis may be found in Baer and Delitzsch's convenient edition of the text of that book, pp. 79 f.: see, further, their *Isaiah*, p. 82, and Kalisch, ii. § xiii. 7.

[4] In these cases attention is often (though not always) called to the change by a Masoretic note at the bottom of the page: see p. 115 note; also Baer and Delitzsch, *Genesis*, p. 96; *Isaiah*, pp. 95 f.

is allowed to *revert to the penultima*, e. g. Deut. viii. 10 וְאָכַלְתָּ וְשָׂבַעְתָּ. xxviii. 39. Judg. iv. 8 וְהָלַכְתִּי.

102. We thus obtain *two* cases in which a *regular* verb, that would under other circumstances have the tone thrown forward, *retains it on the penultima*, (1) where the verb is *immediately followed* by a tone-syllable, (2) where the verb is *in pausa*. The position thus assumed by the tone, it will be seen, is a natural inference from the general principles regulating the changes that take place in all other words similarly placed.

103. It will not be necessary to comment further upon the first of these cases: nor does the second call for any additional remark so far as *sillûq* and *athnach* are concerned, as the usage is there clear and uniform. But in reference to the *minor* distinctive accents, the practice of the language must be more attentively examined, as it will be found to explain a difficulty which arises from a certain small number of seemingly anomalous instances in which the tone is *not* thrown forward after וְ *conversive*, although, at first sight, no reason seems to exist for the neglect of the usual rule. The fact is, that in these cases a *smaller distinctive* is really present, which the eye is apt to overlook: *sillûq*, *athnach*, and *zaqef* are better known and more readily distinguished. In order to exhibit the influence of these smaller distinctives in as clear a light as possible, it will be well, in the first place, to shew that instances occur in which they produce the same lengthening of a vowel as those accents which mark a more decided pause: when this has been done, it will no longer surprise us to find that they likewise resemble the latter in hindering the tone after *waw conversive* from passing forward to the ultima.

Thus with *ṭifcha*, Gen. xv. 14 יעבדו. Lev. xxvii. 10. Num. xxi. 20 וְנִשְׁקָפָה. Deut. xiii. 5 תֵּלֵכוּ. 1 Kings xx. 18, 40 *b*. Is. iii. 26. xxvii. 10[1]. Jer. i. 8. Hos. vii. 11. viii. 7 יִזְרָעוּ. Amos iii. 8 שָׁאָג al.

revia', Lev. v. 23 גָּזֵל. Deut. v. 14 בהמתך. xiii. 7. Hos. vii. 12 יֵלֵכוּ. Hag. i. 6. Neh. xii. 43 etc.

pashṭa, Is. xxxiii. 20 בַּל־יִצָּעֶן. 2 Kings iii. 25 יַסְתֹּמוּ. Dan. ix. 19 שְׁמָעָה. Neh. iii. 34 al.

And in the poetical books:—

ṣinnor, Ps. xxxi. 11 חַיָּי. xciii. 1.

great revia', Ps. xix. 14 עַבְדֶּךָ. xxxvii. 20 יֹאבֵדוּ. xlvii. 10 al. Job xxi. 17. xxiv. 12 יִנְאָקוּ; and when preceded by *geresh*, Ps. xxxvii. 6, 23 כּוֹנָנוּ. Job ix. 20 *b*. אָנִי. xvii. 1.

dechi, Ps. v. 12 יַרְנֵנוּ. xlv. 2 אֲנִי. xcvii. 1. Job ix. 20 f. xvii. 1[2].

104. These instances (which might readily be multiplied) afford ample proof that a minor distinctive is competent to give rise to the pausal change of vowel —a prerogative only regularly exercised by *athnach* and *silluq*: it will not, therefore, now seem anomalous when we see that, like the latter, they also prevent the tone after *waw conversive* from being thrown forward, even though the pause in the sense indicated by their presence may not be sufficiently decided to produce at the same time the accompanying lengthening of the vowel which usually

---

[1] Cf. Is. lxiv. 3 with Delitzsch's note: יעשה is also attested by Chayyûg'—in Mr. Nutt's edition, p. 59 (70 in the translation).

[2] And with still smaller accents Lev. v. 18. Ezek. xl. 4. 1 Kings i. 26. iii. 25. Deut. xiii. 7: Ps. v. 12. Prov. xxx. 4. For several of the passages referred to I am indebted to Ewald, § 100 *c*.

ensues in the case of the other two accents named. Accordingly we find—

In prose books :—

With *zaqef*, Deut. ii. 28 וְאָכַלְתִּי. 1 Sam. xxix. 8 ונלחַמתי; and *zaqef-gadol*, Deut. xxxii. 40 ואמַרתי.

ṭifcha, Joel iv. 21 וְנִקֵּיתִי. Obadiah 10 וְנִכְרַתָּ. Is. lxvi. 9 וְעָצַרְתִּי (where the וְ must be conversive, and introduce a question, as 1 Sam. xxv. 11 וְלָקַחתִּי).

revia', 2 Sam. ix. 10 וְהֵבֵאתָ[1].

pashṭa, Jer. iv. 2 וְנִשְׁבַּעְתָּ.

In poetical books :—

With *great revia'*, Ps. l. 21 Hitz. Prov. xxx. 9 *a* פן אשבע וכחשתי וְאָמַרְתִּי. Job vii. 4 *a* וְאָמַרְתִּי.

And *revia'* with *geresh*, Ps. xix. 14 וְנִקֵּיתִי. xxviii. 1 פן תחשה וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי. Prov. xxiii. 8. xxx. 9 *b*. Job xxxi. 29 אם אשמח . . . וְהתעוֹרַרתי *if I used to rejoice . . . and elate myself.*

dechi, Job v. 24 f. וְיָדַעְתָּ (notice following dagesh in כִּי: the tone must be *mil'el*, else why no *metheg* under יָ as in the otherwise similar passage xi. 18, 19 ?). xxii. 13 וְאָמַרְתָּ. xxxii. 16 probably[2].

---

[1] Disallowed by Böttcher, ii. 204, who appeals to 2 Kings ix. 7. Jer. xxi. 6. But הביא, in both the first and the second person, is everywhere else *milra'* (Lev. xxvi. 36 is, of course, to be explained by § 102. 1), and as regards the two passages cited, it is the exception for the tone in Hif'il not to be thrown on, and no one contends that the usage, with the minor distinctives, is so uniform that they *always* keep it back. Probably also in Gen. xxiv. 8. 1 Sam. xxiii. 2 *a*. Is. viii. 17 *a* 'וח the *mil'el* tone is to be attributed, at least partially, in the two former to the presence of *zaqef*, in the latter to that of *pashṭa*.

[2] I believe these are all the occasions upon which the accents named prevent the tone being thrown forward after *waw conversive*.

The reader will now be prepared to proceed to the closer examination of the remarkable idiom which, without some elucidation of the nature of accents and the laws which regulate their use, it would be impossible either to appreciate or to explain[1].

It must be understood, however, that the influence of the smaller distinctives, as exhibited in both these sections, is quite exceptional: in the majority of instances they effect no change in the form of a word: see, for example, Ex. xviii. 16. Deut. viii. 6. 2 Sam. xi. 21. On the other hand, we occasionally find the non-pausal form retained even with *athnach* and *sôph-pâsûq*: see instances in Kalisch, ii. xiii. 3, and add Prov. xxx. 9 *a*.

[1] Since writing this chapter I have seen a treatise by A. B. Davidson, entitled *Outlines of Hebrew Accentuation* (London 1861), which appears to contain within a small compass a full and clearly-arranged account of the accents and of the laws regulating their use. On pp. 35–52, in particular, will be found some good illustrations of their value as logical or syntactical symbols.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Perfect with Strong Waw.

105. A construction which is the direct antithesis of that which was last examined (in Chap. VI) will now engage our attention. Both are peculiar to Hebrew: and both, where possible, declare their presence to the ear by a change in the position of the tone; but while in the one the tone recedes, in the other it advances. The one is the form adapted to represent actions conceived as *real*, or as appertaining to a definite date, the other—and we shall perceive this distinction most plainly when we come to compare the cases in which the infinitive and participle break off into one or other of these constructions respectively—is the form adapted to represent such as can be only *contingently* realised, or are indeterminate in their character or time of occurrence. If the one can be applied to the future only when it is contemplated as fixed and definite, the other can be applied to events in the past or present only so long as the time of their taking place is conceived as unfixed and indefinite. The one, accordingly, is the companion and complement of the *perfect*, the other is the companion and complement of the *imperfect*. יָרַד וַיַּעֲמֹד denote two concrete events:

יָרַד וְעָמַד denote two abstract possibilities, the context fixing the particular conditions upon which their being realised depends. And exactly as before, when the verb became separated from the ·וְ, it lapsed into the *perfect*, so here, when its connection with וְ is broken, it lapses regularly into the *imperfect:* in both cases, then, it is essentially the *union* of the verb with the conjunction which gives rise to and conditions the special signification assumed by the formula as a whole.

Obs. Like the construction with ·וְ, the present idiom is hardly found beyond the Old Testament: it is never met with in Aramaic (Chaldee and Syriac), and according to Ewald, § 231 *c*, occurs only very rarely in the Mishna. As I wished to learn more exactly what was involved in the latter statement, I applied to my friend Dr. Neubauer, Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library, whose intimate acquaintance with the wide field of talmudic and mediaeval Hebrew is well known, for further information: and he very kindly wrote me that though it was used by modern writers in imitation of the Biblical idiom, there was no ו *conversive* in rabbinical Hebrew, or in the language of the Mishna. On some passages in the Qor'an, where the perfect, both with and without the conjunction و, is used of *future* time, see App. III.

106. However difficult it may appear to find a satisfactory explanation of this so-called *waw conversivum praeteriti*, one thing is perfectly clear, and ought most carefully to be borne in mind: a *real difference* of some kind or other exists between the use of the perfect with simple *waw*, and the use of the perfect with *waw conversive*, and the external indication of this difference is to be found in the *alteration of the tone* which constantly attends and accompanies it. This alteration of tone must unquestionably have constituted a recognised element in the traditions now embodied in the Masoretic system of

punctuation; and the authorities who added the points must have felt that in indicating this change of tone they were only adhering to a practice current in their day, and doubtless handed down from a period when Hebrew was a living and growing language—a practice which they could not disregard, because, had they done so, their work would have been but imperfectly performed, and its results only partially intelligible. For, it must be distinctly remembered, the cases in which וְ *conversive* is employed are, in a syntactical point of view, *totally dissimilar* to those in which the simple וְ is used. The difference in form is thus essentially relative to a difference in grammatical value; and, slight though the change may appear, וְקָטַלְתָּ can never be substituted for וְקָטַלְתָּ without introducing a material modification of the sense. Exactly, therefore, as in English and German, we must not stultify ourselves by reading *con'vict, inva'lid, pre'sent, geb'et* (give!), where the context dèmands *convict', in'valid', present', gebet'* (prayer), so in Hebrew we must beware of saying *w'qaṭálta* when grammar and logic call for *w'qáṭaltá.*

107. But upon what principle does the change of tone correspond to or represent a change of meaning? Or, putting for the moment the change of tone out of the question, what principle will explain the use of the perfect in the present connection at all? What is the mysterious power which enables the Hebrew to say פֶּן יָבוֹא וְהִכַּנִי *lest he come and smite me,* but peremptorily and inexorably forbids him to say פֶּן יָבוֹא וְאֹתִי הִכָּה, which, if he desires to throw the verb later on in the sentence, forces him to write פֶּן יָבוֹא וְאֹתִי יַכֶּה, but at once, as though alarmed at the prospect of any further encroachment on the

part of the intrusive imperfect, shrinks back in horror as it vetoes פֶּן יָבוֹא וַיַּכֵּנִי?

Although one of the most prominent uses of the perfect with *waw* is after an imperative, or in the description of the future, and it might therefore be thought capable of explanation on the principle of the prophetic perfect, or the perfect of certainty, it must not be forgotten that there are many other occasions of a widely different character, upon which, nevertheless, the same construction is employed: we thus require some more *general* principle than that of the prophetic perfect, which will account for the latter at the same time. We also require some explanation of the fact that, while the form וְכָפַרְתָּ אֹתָהּ Gen. vi. 14 occurs often enough, we never meet with וְאֹתָהּ כָּפַרְתָּ, or even וְאֹתָהּ כָּפַרְתָּ, but only with וְאֹתָהּ תְּכַפֶּר (or the imperative, if necessary).

108. According to Ewald, § 234 *a*, *b*, the construction of the perfect with ו *conversive* (the 'relatively-progressive' perfect: cf. above, p. 76[2]) was originally evoked by the opposite idiom of the imperfect with ו *conversive:* there are many well-known aspects under which the two tenses stand contrasted, and the use of the one naturally suggests the other as its antithesis, and so in the present case a specific application of the latter generated as its counterpart a corresponding application of the former. Just as before we saw how sequence in time or association in thought caused an already completed action to be viewed as passing into a new phase, assuming a fresh development in the next act taken up by the narrative, so here it has the contrary result of occasioning a *nascent* action to be viewed as *advancing to completion*, as no longer remaining in suspension, but as being (so to say)

precipitated. Olshausen, § 229 *a*, and Böttcher, § 975 D, express themselves similarly—the former remarking that the use of the perfect rests originally upon a 'play of the imagination,' in virtue of which an action when brought into relation with a preceding occurrence as its *consequence*, from the character of inevitability it then assumes, is contemplated as actually completed. To this we must add that the consciousness of this relation is to be conceived as essentially dependent upon *union* with *waw*, of which union the change of tone (where not hindered from taking place by external or accidental causes) is the inseparable criterion and accompaniment: dissolve this union, and the sense of any special relationship immediately vanishes. In fact, the *waw* appears really in this connection to possess a demonstrative significance, being equivalent to *then* or *so*[1]: in this capacity, by a pointed reference to some preceding verb, it *limits* the possible realisation of the action it introduces to those instances in which it can be treated as a direct consequence of the event thus referred to. And we may conjecture that the emphatic alteration of tone is designed to mark this limitation: the changed pronunciation *wᵉqáṭalti*, *wᵉqáṭaltá* seems to cry *There!* to attract the hearer's attention, and warn him against construing what is said in an absolute and unqualified sense, to direct him rather to some particular locality, some previously marked spot, where, and where alone, the assertion may be found verified. An

[1] This is no imaginary meaning, invented for the purpose of overcoming a difficulty: it is one which actually, and not unfrequently, occurs; cf. 'in the day that ye eat thereof ונפקחו *then* (Germ. *so*) will your eyes be opened;' and see in addition the numerous passages cited below, §§ 123–129.

action described by this construction is regarded, it is true, as completed, but *only with reference to the preceding verb*, only so far as the preceding action necessitates or permits. נפַלְתָּה means unreservedly and unconditionally *thou hast fallen*: וְנפַלְתָּה means '*so* hast thou fallen,' '*so*,' namely, confining the possible occurrence of the event to a particular area previously implied or defined. Whatever, therefore, be the shade of meaning borne by the first or '*dominant*' verb, the perfect following, inasmuch as the action it denotes is conceived to take place under the *same* conditions, assumes it too: be the dominant verb a jussive, frequentative, or subjunctive, the perfect is virtually the same. To all intents and purposes the perfect, when attached to a preceding verb by means of this *waw conversive* or *strong waw, loses its individuality*: no longer maintaining an independent position, it passes under the sway of the verb to which it is connected[1].

109. But upon what ground, it will be asked, can the marked avoidance of וְ in all such cases be accounted for? What is there to deter the Hebrew from saying 'lest he come *and go on* to smite me?' The fact is, וְ was so appropriated by the universal custom of the language to the description of actual fact, that a sense of incongruity and anomaly would have arisen had it been adopted also on occasions where the events spoken of were merely *contingent*. Moreover, it must have been felt that with an action in itself only *incipient* or nascent, any idea of *continuation* or development was out of place:

[1] This peculiarity may sometimes be imitated in English by linking together as infinitives under the same auxiliary (instead of repeating the latter with each different verb) the perfects connected in the original by means of *waw*.

where the series is begun by a form which, like the imperfect, denotes essentially an act that is inchoate or incomplete, all possibility of free and unconditional progress (such as is expressed by וְ) is at once obviously checked: the only kind of *ulterior advance* imaginable under the circumstances is that which may ensue when the now indeterminate and incomplete act is *determined and completed.* After בָּא, וַיַּכֻּנִי denotes a subsequent act without any kind of reserve or limitation, בא ויכני *he came and smote me:* after יָבֹא, nothing thus *unconditionally* subsequent can find place because יבא itself is inchoate and incomplete; nothing therefore definite can be annexed to יבא, *until it has matured into* בָּא. Still, upon the hypothesis that it has matured, further eventualities may be conceived: and so we find יבא followed by וְהִכָּנִי, where the *perfect* tense implies that the eventuality has occurred, while the *waw* limits its occurrence to such occasions as fall within the scope of the preceding dominant verb. Accordingly we get איך, למה, אולי, אם, למען, מן יבא והכני 'lest, that, if, he come—*then* or *so* (i. e. upon the supposition that the first statement is realised)—*has* or (as our idiom would prefer on account of the *condition* implied) *had he smitten me'*='lest he come *and smite me:*' 'perhaps he may come—*and then has he* or *had he smitten me'*='perhaps he may come *and smite me:*' 'why, how should he come—*τότε ἐπάταξεν ἂν ἐμέ*[1], so hätte er mich geschlagen, *then had he smitten me'*='why, how should he come *and smite me?*' יבא והכני 'he was liable or likely to come, would or used to come—*and then* (whenever this actually happened) *he has* or *had* smitten me'='he would come *and smite me.*'

[1] Cf. with the stronger אז, 2 Kings xiii. 19.

And now we may be able to discern a reason why the Hebrew could say פן יבא והכני, but never פן יבא ואתי הכה: in the former case, the relative nature of הכני and its dependency upon יבא is patent from the intimate union with ו; but in the latter case, on account of the isolated position it holds, הכה seems to be stated absolutely, to have no *special* reference to any other fact. It is in order to preserve a keen sense of the subordination thus essential to the meaning of the construction that the connection with what precedes is so jealously guarded: the moment this connection is broken, the verb lapses into the imperfect, which is, of course, under the same government as the dominant verb, and indeed coordinate with it.

Obs. The preceding remarks will make it plain in what manner the *waw* in this construction can be spoken of as the '*waw* relativum,' and the idiom as a whole as the 'relatively-progressive perfect:' they will also shew in what sense we are justified in still applying to the former the term *waw conversive;* in virtue of the limitation imposed by it upon the perfect, it *changes* and *modifies* the application of the verb, so that the area covered (e. g.) by והכני is by no means coextensive or identical with that represented by the broader הכני. A question, however, here arises as to whether, occasionally, the perfect may not be preserved after its separation from *waw*, or even when the waw has been entirely dropped. The vast number of instances, occurring under every conceivable variety of circumstance, in which the verb, after separation, appears as an *imperfect*, furnishes a strong argument against supposing this to be possible: though an opposite view is expressed by Ewald, § 346 *b*, and Böttcher, ii. p. 205, who cite passages in support of their opinion. These alleged instances, when examined, resolve themselves either into cases of the proph. perfect, or into cases where an obvious change of construction has supervened: in fact, with two or three exceptions, they have been already explained above, § 14 *γ*. The perfect, standing by itself, or preceded by כי, § 14 *α*, *β*, is used of the future precisely as in the passages alleged; now it is impossible to explain the two

former cases by supposing waw to have dropped, for the simple reason that *it could never have been present:* if, therefore, the perfects in § 14 *a*, *β*, can be accounted for without having recourse to an imaginary waw conversive, no necessity can exist for having recourse to it in order to account for the perfect in § 14 *γ*. The question is to a certain extent one of *degree:* the force of the tense is undoubtedly *limited* both in the proph. perf. and after waw conversive; but in the one case it is the intelligence of the reader, aided only by the context, that *determines* the limitation, and *localises* the action in the future; in the other case this function is performed by the connecting particle alone. It is thus the context that fixes the meaning of חשך Is. v. 30, or הדה xi. 8, no less than that of גלה v. 13, or מלאה xi. 9. It would take too long to examine the other instances in detail: it is at least suspicious that more numerous and clearer cases do not occur of the bare perfect after למען, אם, כי, etc. As to Prov. ix, *vv.* 4 and 16 are quite different: *v.* 4 is to be explained by § 12 (cf. the pff. *vv.* 1–3), *v.* 16 by § 123 *a*. And when Böttcher says that הסיר התז is 'for' יסיר והתז, he lays himself open to the charge of perpetrating a literary and grammatical enormity.

110. But before analysing the construction in its syntactical aspect, we must first of all state the laws which regulate the *change of tone* previously alluded to. Many forms of the perfect, as קָטְלוּ, אֲמַרְתֶּם, רָעוּ (from רָעָה), שָׁתָה (*to drink*, not שָׁתָה 3 *fem.* from שִׁית) etc., are already *milra'*, and with such, of course, no change is possible: in other cases the general rule is that where the perfect is preceded by waw conversive, *the tone is thrown forward on to the ultima.* But to this law there is a formidable list of exceptions: it will be seen, however, that for the most part they fall into three or four broad groups which can be recollected without difficulty.

Including, for the sake of completeness, the two rules established in the last chapter, we get the following:—

The tone is *not* thrown forward

(1) When the perfect is immediately followed, without

any break in the sense (i. e. without a *distinctive* accent), by a tone-syllable in the succeeding word.

(2) When the perfect is *in pausa*—almost invariably with the greater distinctives, and sometimes also with those of smaller value. Of these two rules no further illustrations will be needed.

Obs. So far as the *regular* verb is concerned, the tone is *uniformly* thrown on in the 1st and 2nd sing., except in the cases covered by these two rules. In 1 Sam. xvii. 35. Job vii. 4 *b* (assuming the verbs to be frequentative) I conceive the accentuation והצָלתי, ושגָעתי to have arisen from a misconception: the preceding verbs ויצָאתי, ומדד were really frequentative, but, there being no change of tone (see rule 4) to mark this fact, it was forgotten, and then the perfects following were subjoined by means of simple *waw* according to § 132.

(3) In 1 *plur.* of all the modifications, and in 3 *fem. sing.* and 3 *plur.* of Hif'il. Thus Gen. xxxiv. 17 וְלָקָחְנוּ. Ex. viii. 23 וְזָבַחְנוּ: Lev. xxvi. 22 וְהִכְרִיתָה. Amos ix. 13 וְהִפְּיפוּ. Ezek. xi. 18 וְהֵסִירוּ. It is also naturally not thrown on in 2 *fem. sing.* of verbs with a guttural as their third radical, as וְיָדַעַתְּ Hos. ii. 22.

Obs. Upon two occasions in Hif'il the general rule is observed: Ex. xxvi. 33. Lev. xv. 29.

(4) In the *Qal* of verbs ל״א and ל״ה, as Gen. vii. 4 וּמָחִיתִי. xvii. 4 וְהָיִיתָ, 19 וְקָרָאתָ. xviii. 26 וְנָשָׂאתִי.

Obs. If the list in Böttcher, ii. 204, is complete, besides ובאתָ (and this only before a guttural) there are but two instances of Qal *milra'* after ו, viz. Lev. xxiv. 5 (gutt.) and 2 Sam. xv. 33[1]. But in the other modifications the tone is, in the majority of instances, thrown on according to rule, as Ex. xxv. 11. Lev. xxvi. 9 etc.; although a few exceptions are found, cf. Deut. iv. 19. xi. 10. xxviii. 12 al.

[1] He cites indeed 1 Sam. x. 2. Jer. ii. 2. iii. 12 as well: but there is no proof that in these verses the perfects are *milra'*. There is no metheg in the antepenultima, and Böttcher seems to have been misled by the *postpositive* accent *small telisha*: see Is. lxii. 4. lxvi. 20.

(5) Often in those forms of the *Qal* and *Nif'al* in verbs ע״ע and ע״י which end in ־וּ or ־הָ, as Ex. vii. 28 וּבָאוּ. Is. vi. 13 וְשָׁבָה. xxxiv. 3 וְנָמַסּוּ. xxxv. 10 וְנָסוּ: but the usage here is very fluctuating, as many of these verbs also occur *milra'*; see Ex. viii. 7. xxiii. 29. Is. xi. 14. xxiii. 17 etc.

Obs. In the other forms the general rule is adhered to, as Gen. xxviii. 21 וְשַׁבְתִּי. Deut. iv. 30 וְשַׁבְתָּ. Ps. lxxxix. 24 וְקַמְתִּי. Ex. xxiii. 25 וְהֵסַרְתִּי. Ezek. xvi. 42 וְהִנַּחְתִּי. Num. xiv. 15 וְהָמַתָּה etc. Exceptions (unless when occasioned in accordance with rules 1 or 2, as Gen. xix. 19 *b*. Ex. xxxiii. 14) are extremely rare: 1 Kings ii. 31. Jer. x. 18[1]. Amos i. 8[1]. Zeph. i. 17 being probably all that exist.

111. It has been already remarked that the peculiar position occupied by the perfect, when thus annexed by וְ, as regards the dominant or principal verb, causes it virtually to assume the particular modal phase belonging to the latter. If, for instance, the principal verb involve *will*, *would*, or *let* . . ., the subordinate verbs connected with it by וְ *conversive* must be understood in the same tense or mood; in other words, as governed by the same auxiliary: 2 Kings v. 11 I said יָצֹא וְעָמֹד וְקָרָא he *will* (or *would*, if in or. obliqua) come out and stand and call: the writer might, had he chosen, have repeated the impf. יצא ויעמד ויקרא he would come out, and would stand, and would call: this would have been somewhat more emphatic, and greater stress would have been laid on the precise manner in which each individual action was con-

[1] In these two passages the *mil'el* tone is attested by the Masôra: in Zephaniah it may have been partly occasioned, as Olshausen suggests (p. 461), by the counter-tone in the following word לְאֹרֶם.

ceived: but upon this occasion he preferred to adopt the shorter and more flowing mode of expression. Or again, Ps. cix. 10 and *let* his sons be vagabonds וְשִׁאֵלוּ *and* beg: or, after an infinitive, 1 Kings ii. 37 in the day that thou goest out (=in whatever day) וְעָבַרְתָּ *and passest* over Qidron (or, in the day of thy going out *and passing* over). Now where—as is continually the case in Hebrew—there is a *change of person* between the first and any of the following verbs, we shall find it in English awkward, if not impossible, to adopt such a succinct method of translation: either the auxiliary will have to be repeated each time the person changes, or, since the perfect in the original really indicates a result which follows or is a consequence of the action denoted by the principal verb, we may be at liberty to employ *that* with the subjunctive. Gen. xxiv. 7 may HE send his angel before thee וְלָקַחְתָּ *and mayest* thou take (or better, *that* thou mayest take) a wife for my son from there. xviii. 25 far be it from thee . . . לְהָמִית to slay the righteous with the wicked וְהָיָה *and for* the righteous *to be* as the wicked (or, *that so* the righteous *should* be as the wicked: more neatly in Latin, Absit a te *ut occidas* justum cum iniquo, *fiatque* justus sicut impius). 1 Chron. xxii. 11 יְהִי *may* Yahweh be with thee וְהַצְלַחְתָּ *and* thou prosper (or, *so that* thou mayest prosper). Jer. xlviii. 26 make him drunk . . . וְסָפַק and *let* Moab vomit (or, *that* Moab may vomit).

112. We may now proceed to analyse the mode in which this idiom is employed.

The perfect with וְ *conv.* appears as the continuation of

(i) the imperative.

Gen. vi. 14 make thee an ark וכפרת *and pitch* it, 21 ואספת. viii. 17 bring them out with thee וְשַׁרְצוּ *and let*

them swarm in the earth. (Here notice 1. the *grammar* alone shews that the *waw* is conversive: the tone in שׁרְצוּ is already *milra'*, so that no alteration can take place from the accession of וּ: we must, however, judge of such cases by the analogy of those in which, under similar syntactical conditions, i. e. in the present case, after an imperative, the change of tone can be observed: this analogy leaves us no doubt that the waw is conversive here as well. Notice 2. that the dependency of וְשׁרְצוּ upon the imperative is *obscured* in English by the singular weakness of our language, which all but forbids our using a genuine third pers. imperative, except in exalted or poetical style: the interpolation of *let* makes it seem as though *let them swarm* were quite independent of *bring them out:* whereas in the Hebrew the sense to be given to וְשׁרְצוּ is *wholly determined* by the meaning of the dominant verb, which is here an imperative. In a point like this, either German, Latin, or Greek has the advantage of English.) Ex. iii. 16 go וְאָסַפְתָּ וְאָמַרְתָּ etc. xix. 23. Lev. xxiv. 14 bring forth him that cursed וְסָמְכוּ *and let* all those that heard *lay* their hands upon his head (*educ et ponant*, Vulg.). Num. iv. 19 this do to them וְחָיוּ *and let* them live וְלֹא יָמוּתוּ (note the *impf.*) *and not die* etc. 1 Sam. vi. 7 f. 2 Sam. xi. 15 set 'Uriah etc. וְשַׁבְתֶּם מאחריו וְנִכֶּה וָמֵת *and retire* from behind him, *and let him be* smitten and die (Vulg. *ut percussus intereat*). xxiv. 2 go now through all the tribes וְיֵדְעֻתִי *and let* me know. Ezek. xx. 20 et sabbata mea sanctificate וְהָיוּ *et sint* (=*ut sint*, Vulg.) signum inter me et vos.

This is by far the most common construction after an imperative: sometimes, however, a succession of imperatives is preferred, and sometimes the perfect and

imperative alternate: Gen. xxvii. 43 f. וְקוּם בְּרַח . . . וְשַׁבְתָּ. xlv. 9. 1 Sam. vi. 7 f. Prov. xxiii. 1 f. etc.

> **113.** (ii) After an *imperfect*, in any of its senses: thus—

(1) After the impf. as a pure future:—

Gen. xviii. 18 and Abraham will be a great nation וְנִבְרְכוּ *and* all nations of the earth *will be* blessed in him. xl. 13 he will lift up thy head והשיבך *and restore* thee to thy place, וְנָתַתָּ *and thou wilt give* etc. Judg. vi. 16 I shall be with thee וְהִכִּיתָ *and* thou *wilt* smite Midian (or, *will* and *shalt*). 1 Sam. xvii. 32 thy servant will go וְנִלָּחֵם *and fight*. Is. i. 30 f. ii. 2 f., 4. lx. 5. Jer. xvi. 4 etc.; or as expressing a purpose or a command (*I will, thou shalt*). Gen. xxiv. 4. Ex. viii. 23. xx. 9 etc.

And similarly after other words pointing to the future, as a *participle*, Gen. vi. 17 f. and behold, I am bringing the deluge upon the earth והקמתי *and will* establish etc. xlviii. 4 behold, I am making thee fruitful והרביתך *and will* multiply thee . . . וְנָתַתִּי[1] *and give* this land etc. Is. vii. 14 *and will call* his name 'Immanu'el. viii. 7 f. Jer. xxx. 22. xxxvii. 7 f. וְשָׁבוּ. Hosea ii. 8, 16 f. Amos ii. 14 ואבד. vi. 14 etc.; or an *infin. absolute*, as Is. v. 5. xxxi. 5; cf. Jer. vii. 9 f.

Often after the *prophetic perfect*, the announcement *opening* generally with the proph. perf., which is then followed by the perfect with *waw conv.*: thus Gen. xvii. 20 I have blessed him וְהִפְרֵיתִי and I *will* make him fruitful. Num. xxiv. 17 וקם and *will* rise up. Is. ii. 11 ונשגב (cf. *vv.* 12–17). v. 14 (prob.; but as the verbs here do not

[1] The two accents on this word must not be confused with the double *pashṭa* on words *mil'el*, § 91: the first accent is a conjunctive termed *Qadma*, which is here used in place of metheg to mark the counter-tone (p. 111[1]). Cf. Ewald, § 97 *g*.

admit of a change of tone, it is possible they ought to be explained by § 132). xliii. 14 שׁלַחתי I send to Babel וְהוֹרַדְתִּי *and will bring down* etc. xlviii. 15. lii. 10 וראו. Jer. xiii. 26. xlviii. 41. Zech. v. 4 etc.

(2) After the impf. as a jussive or cohortative :—

(a) Gen. i. 14 יְהִי let there be lights וְהָיוּ *and let them be* . . . xliii. 14 ושלח. xlvii. 29 f. bury me not in Egypt וְשָׁכַבְתִּי *but let* me lie with my fathers. Ex. v. 7 *let* THEM go וקششו *and gather* themselves straw. xxxiv. 9. Deut. xxviii. 8. 1 Sam. xii. 20. xxiv. 13 *let* Yahweh judge וְנָקָמַנִי *and* avenge me! 1 Kings i. 2. viii. 28 (after 26). xxii. 12 (ironical) *and* Yahweh give it into thy hands! Ps. lxiv. 11. cix. 10.

(β) Gen. xxxi. 44 come let us make a covenant וְהָיָה *and let* it be etc. Judg. xix. 13 *let* us draw near to one of the places וְנָלִינוּ *and* pass the night in Gib'ah. Mic. iv. 6 f. Ruth ii. 7 let me glean, I pray, וְאָסַפְתִּי *and gather* etc.

(3) After an impf. denoting *would* or *should*:—Amos ix. 3 f. from there *would* I command my sword והרגתם *and* it *should* slay them וְשַׂמְתִּי *and I would* etc. Job viii. 6. ix. 17 with a tempest *would* he overwhelm me וְהִרְבָּה *and multiply* my bruises without cause. 31. Judg. xvi. 5 (*may*).

(4) Or after the impf. as a frequentative, whether present or past, but most commonly the latter:—

(a) Gen. ii. 24 therefore doth a man leave his father and mother ודבק *and cleave* to his wife והיו *and they are* one flesh. Ex. xviii. 16 when they have a matter יוּבָא אֵלַי וְשָׁפַטְתִּי[1] *they come to me and I decide* between

[1] So we must read in place of בָּא: for the apodosis after כי, in the sense of *whenever*, to be introduced by the bare perfect, would be an unparalleled solecism.

them. Is. v. 12 והיו (observe in *b* יבימו . . . ו). xxvii. 10. xxviii. 28 threshes it וְהָמַם *and drives* etc. xliv. 15. Jer. xiii. 3[1] thou seest me וּבָחַנְתָּ *and triest* my heart. xx. 9[1] ואמרתי and *I keep saying* 'I will not speak of him' . . . והיה *and then* there comes in my heart as it were a burning fire וְנִלְאֵיתִי *and I am weary* of forbearing etc. (Auth. Vers. here seems to describe a *single* occurrence, and conveys no idea of the *repetition* so plainly discernible in the original. Auth. Vers. must have been וָאֹמַר etc.). Hos. iv. 3. vii. 7 יחמו וְאכלו (their *reiterated* ebullitions described). Mic. ii. 2 (after יעשוה *v.* 1). Ps. x. 10 ישח ונפל. xvii. 14 they have their fill of children והניחו *and leave* etc. xlvi. 10. xlix. 11. lxxiii. 11 ואמרו after ימצו *v.* 10. lxxviii. 38 but HE is merciful, forgiveth iniquity, and doth not destroy (impff.), וְהִרְבָּה *and is bounteous* to turn his anger away. xc. 6. Prov. xvi. 29. xviii. 10. xx. 28. xxiv. 16. xxix. 6. Job v. 5. xiv. 11 and a river will (freq.) decay וְיָבֵשׁ *and dry up.* xxxiii. 18 f. xxxiv. 7 f.

(β) Gen. ii. 6 a mist *used to* go up וְהִשְׁקָה *and water* the ground. vi. 4. xxix. 2 f. an instructive passage: 'three flocks *were lying* there (partcp.), for ישקו they *used* to water flocks from that well,' this is then followed by four pff. freqq. The course of the narrative is resumed only at ויאמר 4: it is clear that *v.* 3 cannot belong to it, for *v.* 8 shews that the stone *had not been* rolled away, so that וגללו describes what *used* to be done. The sudden

---

[1] These two passages (cf. Ex. xviii. 16. Amos iv. 7) are important as shewing that the *waw* after a *frequentative* impf. is really conversive: from the nature of the case the verb is under such circumstances generally in the *third* person, in which the distinctive change of tone can rarely occur.

change of tense—from impf. with וַ֫ to pf. with וְ—is most noticeable, and immediately arrests the attention. Contrast the similar scene Ex. ii. 16 f., where the impff. with וַ֫ describe a continuous series of events happening while Moses was at the well. Ex. xxxiii. 7–11 יקח ונטה־לו *would* (or used to) *take and pitch it* (contrast this with a passage like xxxv. 21–29, וַ֫ describing what took place upon only *one* occasion). xxxiv. 34 f. 1 Kings xiv. 28 *used to* bear them והשיבום *and bring them* back. 2 Kings iii. 25 יהרסו . . . ישליכו וטלאה . . . ו (a graphic picture of the way in which the people occupied themselves during their sojourn in Moab). xii. 15–17. Job xxxi. 29 if I *used to* rejoice . . . וְהִתְעָרַרְתִּי[1] *and elate* myself etc.

After a partcp.:—2 Sam. xv. 30 ועלו. Is. vi. 2 f. were standing וקרא *and each kept* crying. xl. 6. Prov. ix. 14 וישבה *and keeps* sitting.

And an inf. abs.:—2 Sam. xii. 16 וַיְצָם צֹם וּבָא וְלָן וְשָׁכַב and he fasted on, *repeatedly* (during the seven days, *v.* 18) going in, and passing the night (there), and lying on the earth. Jer. xxiii. 14. Josh. vi. 13 הלכים הלוך ותקעו (contrast 1 Sam. xix. 23 וַ֫).

114. Sometimes after a fact has been stated summarily by a perfect, we find this tense succeeded by perfects with *waw conversive*, as though to remind the reader of the real character of what is described: that in such cases the *waw* is conversive, and not merely conjunctive (Chap. IX), is often shewn by the proximity of an *imperfect*, the frequentative sense of which is unmistakeable. At other times, on the other hand, when the frequentative nature of the events described has been sufficiently

[1] Tone as Ps. xxviii. 1, § 104.

indicated, the writer, feeling that this circumstance does not call for *continual* prominence, reverts to the ordinary form of prose narrative, as carried on by וְ.

Thus (*a*) Num. xi. 8 שטו ולקטו (observe the impf. יָרַד *v.* 9). Amos iv. 7 וְהִמְטַרְתִּי . . . מָנַעְתִּי (a noticeable passage on account of the clear change of tone: observe, too, the following impff.). 2 Kings vi. 10. 2 Chron. xii. 11.

(*β*) Judg. xii. 5 והיה כי יאמרו and it used to be whenever they said . . . וַיֹּאמְרוּ that they replied etc. 1 Sam. ii. 16. xiii. 22 *b* (cf. the impf. *v.* 19). xiv. 52. 2 Sam. xv. 2. Jer. vi. 17 וַיֹּאמְרוּ . . . והקמתי (see § 120). xviii. 4. Ps. lxxviii. 40 f. Job i. 4 f.

The same transition occurs also after the imperfect itself:—Is. xliv. 12. Hos. ii. 15 תקטיר וַתַּעַד. Ps. cvi. 43 וַיִּמְכְּרוּ . . . ימרו. Job iii. 24. v. 15 f. vii. 18 (even with לבקרים). xi. 13. xii. 25. xiv. 10. xxi. 14. xxxi. 27 (contrast *v.* 29 just quoted) etc.

Obs. In some of these cases the וְ introduces the definite act which terminates a scene previously described, or the settled state which succeeds or accompanies the reiterated actions: so Judg. vi. 5. Hos. ii. 15. Ps. lxxviii. 35: cf. xcix. 7. Prov. vii. 13 *b* (in *a* the pff. are frequentative). Comp. Böttcher, ii. 216.

115. The perfect with *waw conversive* is further found where the imperfect is preceded by various particles: as

אולי *perhaps:* Gen. xxvii. 12 *perhaps* my father will feel me וְהָיִיתִי and I shall be . . . וְהֵבֵאתִי *and* I *shall* bring upon myself a curse. Num. xxiii. 27. 2 Sam. xvi. 12. 2 Kings xix. 4. Jer. xxvi. 3 (where ישמעו וישובו being closely connected together are in the same tense: then follows וְנִחַמְתִּי). Num. xxii. 11 after אוכל (in *v.* 6 the *impf.*).

אוֹ *or if:* 1 Sam. xxvi. 10 *or if* his day should come וָמֵת *and* he *die*. Ezek. xiv. 17, 19.

אֵיךְ *how:* Gen. xxxix. 9 *how* can I do this great evil וחטאתי *and sin* against God? 2 Sam. xii. 18 *how* shall we say to him, The child is dead, ועשה (translating freely to shew the connection) *and so make* him vex himself? Esth. viii. 6 (with אוכל).

אַל[1]: Jer. xvii. 21 *do not* bear any burden on the sabbath-day והבאתם *and bring* it etc. Ps. cxliii. 7 *do not* hide thy face from me ונמשלתי *and let me be* like them that go down into the pit (tone as in the parallel Ps. xxviii. 1, after פן).

אִם *if:* Gen. xxxii. 9 *if* 'Esau comes to one camp והכּהו *and smites* it; and so countless times: see further on hypotheticals below, Chap. X.

Similarly after אם=*num?* as in an oath: Gen. xxiv. 38. Ezek. xx. 33 f. as I live, if I will not be king over you . . . והוצאתי and bring you forth from the people וקבצתי and gather you!

אֲשֶׁר=*so that:* Deut. ii. 25. iv. 6 *so that* they will hear ואמרו *and say.*

=*when:* Num. v. 29. Lev. iv. 22 when a ruler יחטא ועשה sinneth *and doth* etc. (not *hath sinned*, Auth. Vers.).

=*who so* (the person indicated being essentially indefinite ὅστις or ὃς ἐάν with subj.: this construction of אשר is quite distinct from another which will be immediately noticed): Gen. xxiv. 14 the girl *to whom* אֹמַר I may say, Let down thy pitcher, ואמרה *and she reply*, Drink (puella cui ego dixero . . . et illa responderit—the girl, whoever she may be, in whom these two conditions are fulfilled), 43 (where the tone of ואמרתי proves, if proof were needed, that ואמרה in 14 has ו *conversive*). Lev. xxi. 10. Judg. i. 12 LXX rightly ὃς ἂν πατάξῃ καὶ προκαταλάβηται.

---

[1] Cf. Ps. xxxv. 19.

1 Sam. xvii. 26. Is. lvi. 4 אשר ישמרו ובחרו, LXX *ὅσοι ἂν φυλάξωνται καὶ ἐκλέξωνται.* Jer. xvii. 5, 7 (where, from the change of subject in the two verbs יבטח and היה, the translation cannot preserve the conciseness of the original: 'who trusts in Yahweh, and whose hope Yahweh is'). xxvii. 11 *τὸ ἔθνος ὃ ἐὰν εἰσαγάγῃ . . . καὶ ἐργάσηται αὐτῷ.* Ps. cxxxvii. 9 (·שֶׁ).

Lev. xviii. 5 which a man *may* do וָחַי *and live* in them, or since, in the double statement enunciated, the occurrence of the second is so linked to that of the first as to be dependent upon it, 'which *if* a man do, he *may* (or *shall*) live in them.' Ezek. xx. 11, 13. Neh. ix. 29. Deut. xix. 4. Is. xxix. 11. 2 Kings xviii. 21. Neh. vi. 11.

Obs. There is, however, another construction of אשר followed by the *perfect*, or by the impf. and then ·וַ, which must not be confused with that just explained. There the writer had merely an indefinite object in view: here he contemplates a distinct occurrence[1]: compare, with the perfect alone, Lev. vii. 8 the skin of the burnt sacrifice which הִקְרִיב he *hath* offered (in the case assumed). Thus we find Deut. xvii. 2–4 a man who יעשה doeth evil וַיֵּלֶךְ *and goeth* and serveth other gods, וְהֻגַּד *and it be* told thee etc.; or the two constructions united, as Lev. xv. 11 every one whom the זב touches (יגע), and who לא שטף *has* not (or shall not have, in the assumed case) drenched his hands with water. xvii. 3 f. whoso slays an ox . . . and לא הביאו *hath* not brought it etc. (*v.* 9 we find the impf. and *doth* not bring it: Onqelos אֵיתַיהּ, יַיתֵינֵיהּ, and the Peshito ܠܐ ܡܝܬܝܘܗܝ, ܠܐ ܡܝܬܝܘܗܝ retain the difference of tense, which the other versions fail to reproduce). ix. 13 (לא היה and וחדל). Ezek. xviii. 6 (*hath not* eaten, *never* draws near).

הֲ *interrogativum:* Ex. ii. 7 shall I go וְקָרָאתִי and call?

---

[1] Cf. the similar case of אם Num. v. 27 etc. if she *have* made herself unclean, וַתִּמְעַל *and played* false: see below, § 138 *Obs.*

Num. xi. 22 shall flocks be slain for them וּמָצָא and it be enough for them? (with change of subject: or, *so that* it may be enough for them? LXX μὴ σφαγήσονται . . . καὶ ἀρκέσει;) 1 Sam. xxiii. 2. Ruth i. 11 have I still sons in my womb וְהָיוּ and will they be (or, *for them to be*) to you for husbands? 1 Chron. xiv. 10.

Obs. After a *perfect*, Judg. ix. 9, 11, 13 am I to have forsaken my fatness וְהָלַכְתִּי and go?

הֲלֹא: 2 Sam. iv. 11 *shall I not* seek his blood from your hand וּבִעַרְתִּי *and sweep* you from the earth? 2 Kings v. 12 *shall I not* wash in them וְטָהַרְתִּי *and be clean?* Ezek. xxxviii. 14 f. Amos viii. 8. Prov. xxiv. 12.

Or in a simple question: Judg. xv. 18 shall I die of thirst וְנָפַלְתִּי and fall into the hand of the uncircumcised?

הֵן=*if:* Jer. iii. 1 if a man divorces his wife וְהָלְכָה *and she goes* etc. Hag. ii. 12 (for the position of הֵן before the apodosis, cf. Gen. xviii. 24, 28. xxiv. 5 after אולי. Job xiv. 14 after אם).

כַּאֲשֶׁר *as when:* Deut. xxii. 26 as when a man יָקוּם rises up against his neighbour וְרָצָחוֹ *and smites* him mortally. Is. xxix. 8. lxv. 8. Amos v. 19 as when a man flees before the lion וּפָגָעוֹ *and* the bear *meets* him.

כִּי=*that:* Gen. xxxvii. 26 what gain כִּי נַהֲרֹג that we should slay (or, *when, if,* we slay) our brother וְכִסִּינוּ *and conceal* his blood? 1 Sam. xxix. 8 that I am not to go וְנִלָּחֲמָתִי *and fight.* Job xv. 13 why doth thy heart carry thee away . . . that thou shouldst turn thine anger against God וְהוֹצֵאתָ *and so utter* words out of thy mouth? (tone, § 110. 4 *Obs.*)

=*when:* Ex. xxi. 20 when a man smites his servant וָמֵת *and he dies.* Deut. vi. 10 f. when Yahweh bringeth

thee into the land . . . : וְאָכַלְתָּ וְשָׂבַעְתָּ *and thou eatest and art satisfied*, take care etc.: and so constantly.

כִּי אִם=*surely:* 1 Kings xx. 6 surely I will send my servants וחפשו. (2 Sam. xv. 21 Kt. followed by only a single verb.)

Obs. After a perfect (according to § 14 a), 2 Kings v. 20 if I do not run ולקחתי *and get* something from him! Jer. li. 14: cf. Judg. xv. 7, where after a perfect similarly placed we have ואחר אחדל; had not אחר intervened, this would have been וחדלתי.

לֹא or בַּל *not* (the negative not being repeated, but its influence extending *over two clauses:* Gesenius' *Grammar*, § 152. 3; Kalisch, § 104. 9): Ex. xxviii. 43 that they may *not* bear (incur) iniquity וָמֵתוּ *and die.* xxxiii. 20 man *cannot* see me : וָחָי *and live* (cf. Deut. v. 21 that God *may* speak with a man, וָחָי *and he live*). Lev. xi. 43 *b.* xix. 12 ye *shall* not swear falsely וְחִלַּלְתָּ *so that*[1] thou profane the name of God, 29. xxii. 9. Num. iv. 15 they shall not touch what is holy ומתו *and so* die, 20. Deut. vii. 25, 26 *and so* become accursed. xix. 10. xxii. 1, 4 והתעלמת. xxiii. 15. Is. xiv. 21 בל. xxviii. 28 *not* for ever does he thresh it והמם *and drive* the wheel of his cart over it. 2 Chron. xix. 10 והיה. And with the verb separated from ו and so in the impf., Lev. x. 6.

כִּמְעַט *almost:* Gen. xxvi. 10 (with pf. as first verb) almost had one of the people lain with her וְהֵבֵאתָ *and so thou hadst* brought guilt upon us.

לוּ *if:* Ezek. xiv. 15 if I were to cause noisome beasts to pass through the land וְשִׁכַּלְתָּהּ *and they were to* make it bereaved, והיתה *and it were to* become desolate.

---

[1] Disregarding the change of person, 'ye shall not swear falsely *and so* profane.'

למה *why:* 2 Kings xiv. 10 (=2 Chron. xxv. 19) why wouldst (or *shouldst, wilt*) thou challenge misfortune וְנָפַלְתָּה *and fall?* Jer. xl. 15 why *should* he smite thee *and* all Israel *be scattered?* Qoh. v. 5. Dan. i. 10.

Obs. The impf. after למה *may* be frequentative, as 1 Sam. ii. 29, in which case it can be followed by ו, § 114 (β).

לְמַעַן *in order that:* Gen. xii. 13 *that* it may be well with me וְחָיְתָה *and* my soul may live (prosper) because of thee. xviii. 19. Deut. vi. 18 that it may be well with thee וּבָאתָ וִירִשְׁתָּ *and that thou mayest* go and inherit the good land etc. Is. lxvi. 11 and often.

מִי with impf. expressing a *wish:* 2 Sam. xv. 4 O that some one would make me judge, ועלי יבא that to me might come every one who . . . (where if עלי were not intended to be emphatic, we should have had וּבָא עלי) וְהִצְדַּקְתִּיו *and I would* give him justice! Deut. v. 26 O that their heart were . . .! (lit. 'who will grant והיה *that so* their heart *may*' etc.): for other constructions of this phrase see Job vi. 8 תבוא. xix. 23 וְיִכתבון. xxiii. 3 ידעתי: elsewhere the infin., xi. 5. xiii. 5. Ex. xvi. 3.

מִי יוֹדֵעַ=*perhaps:* 2 Sam. xii. 22 Qri (Kt. יחנני, impf. as Joel ii. 14. Jon. iii. 9).

מָתַי *when?* Ps. xli. 6 when will he die וְאָבַד *and* his name *perish?*

עֵקֶב *in return for:* Deut. vii. 12 as a return for (Onqelos חֲלַף דְּ) your hearkening to these statutes ושמרתם *and observing* them[1].

עַד or עַד אֲשֶׁר *until:* Ex. xxiii. 30 until thou multiply וְנָחַלְתָּ *and inherit* the land. Num. xi. 20 והיה. Is. xxxii.

[1] This passage is obscure; but it seems that the verbs must be understood in a frequentative sense: cf. viii. 20.

15 f. עַד יֵעָרֶת וְהָיָה . . . וְשָׁכַן וְ . . . יָשַׁב Hos. v. 15. Mic. vii. 9. Qoh. xii. 1 f. Neh. iv. 5: עַד שֶׁ־ Ct. ii. 17. iv. 6.

Obs. So when the verb after עד is a perfect (§ 17), Is. vi. 11 f.

Similarly in the other construction of עד with an infinitive, Gen. xxvii. 45. Judg. vi. 18 עַד בֹּאִי וְהוֹצֵאתִי; or a substantive, 1 Sam. xiv. 24 until (it be) evening וְנִקַּמְתִּי *and I avenge* myself: this passage shews how Lev. xi. 32. xvii. 15 should be understood ('till the evening (come) and it be clean'). 2 Kings xviii. 32. Is. v. 8 until there is no more room וְהוֹשַׁבְתֶּם *and ye have to* dwell by yourselves in the midst of the land.

Obs. In a few passages a rather singular usage is found after עד, Judg. xvi. 2 saying עד אור הבקר והרגנוהו till the morning dawns and *we kill* him. Josh. i. 15. vi. 10 till the day when I say to you, Shout, וחריעותם *and ye shout*. Gen. xxix. 8. 1 Sam. i. 22 for she said, Till the lad be weaned *and I bring him* etc. 2 Sam. x. 5 (=1 Chron. xix. 5) tarry in Y^e^richo till your beards grow ושבתם *and ye return*. Dan. viii. 14. Is the perfect in these cases to be considered as under the government of the infinitive or imperfect after עד (as I have translated), or as under that of a preceding verb implied or expressed, thus, '(*wait*) till the day when I say, Shout, *and then* shout,' '*tarry* till etc. *and then* return?' The general structure of the sentences seems to favour the former supposition, and, if the latter were true, we might expect אחר added, as Josh. ii. 16. Compare Hdt. iii. 181. 5 ἀποκλινομένης δὲ τῆς ἡμέρης ὑπίεται τοῦ ψυχροῦ, ἐς οὗ δύσεται τε ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ γίνεται χλιαρόν· where the determining moment and the determined event are similarly made co-ordinate, but where in English (disregarding the τε) we should probably exhibit their relation to each other somewhat more explicitly by rendering 'till the sun sets, *and then* the water becomes warm.'

פֶּן *lest:* Gen. iii. 22. xix. 19 lest some evil cleave to me: וָמַתִּי *and I die* (tone as § 110. 2). Ex. i. 10. xxiii. 29. xxxiv. 15 f. פֶּן תִּכְרֹת וְזָנוּ . . . וְאָכַלְתָּ וְלָקַחְתָּ Deut. vi. 15. viii. 14 etc. Hos. ii. 5. Amos v. 6. Ps. xxviii. 1 פֶּן תֶּחֱשֶׁה וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי

lest thou be silent *and I become* like etc. Prov. xxx. 9 (for the tone in these two passages, see § 104). v. 10 ff. (וְנֶהֱמַתָּ, יוֹאַמְרֶת) etc.

116. After all these particles to find the *imperfect repeated* (as Ps. ii. 12 פֶּן יֶאֱנַף וְתֹאבְדוּ) is very exceptional; the following are, I believe, nearly all the instances of such repetition:—

אולי Num. xxii. 6. 1 Kings xviii. 5[1]. Jer. xx. 10. xxi. 2. איך iii. 19. אם xxxi. 36. Job xi. 10. xx. 12 f. xxxvi. 11. הלא Hab. ii. 6 וְיֹאמַר. כי Ps. xlix. 19 (if = *though*). Lam. iii. 8? לא Job vii. 21. למה Prov. v. 20. למען Ex. xxiii. 12. Is. xli. 20. xliii. 10. Ps. lxxviii. 6. מתי Ps. xlii. 3. עד Hos. x. 12, Qoh. xii. 6. Lam. iii. 50 וְיִרְאֶה. פן Jer. li. 46. Ps. ii. 12. Prov. xxxi. 5: cf. Is. xxviii. 24. Ps. lxv. 5.

Obs. 1. Sometimes two words closely connected, or nearly synonymous, are in the impf. followed by the ordinary pf. with וְ *conv.*, Ezek. vi. 6. Hab. ii. 7: cf. Is. xl. 27. Qoh. xii. 4 *b*–5 *a*, and § 115 under אולי.

Obs. 2. Whenever the impf. with כִּי appears after any of these particles, it is because some *definite* act is alluded to: see, for instance, Gen. iii. 17 (כי *because*). xii. 19 why didst thou say, She is my sister וָאֶקַּח *and lead* me to take her? (so we may render to avoid the awkward change of person). xxxi. 27. Judg. v. 7. 1 Sam. xix. 17 *a* (quite different from *b* למה אמיתך (why *should* I slay thee?), which would be succeeded by a pf. and וְ). xxv. 34. 2 Sam. i. 27 (lamenting a fact: xi. 28 deprecating a possibility).

117. The reader will be aware (see Gesenius, §§ 132 rem. 2, 134 rem. 2) that it is a common custom with

---

[1] The *metheg* is here thrown back from the syllable which has the counter-tone on to a preceding *shwa'*: it is then sometimes called *Ga'ya'* געיא i.e. *crying*, from its causing the *shwa'* to be *sounded* rather more audibly than usual. Compare Kalisch, pt. ii. § 10. 3 (*b*); Ewald, § 96 *c*; Böttcher, i. p. 122 *bottom*.

Hebrew writers, after employing a participle or infinitive, to *change the construction*, and, if they wish to subjoin other verbs which logically should be in the partcp. or infin. as well, to pass to the use of the finite verb. Thus Gen. xxvii. 33 הַצָּד צַיִד וַיָּבֵא *ὁ θηρεύσας θήραν καὶ εἰσενέγκας* (lit. *ὁ θηρεύσας θ. καὶ εἰσήνεγκε*). Gen. xxxix. 18 בַּהֲרִימִי קוֹלִי וָאֶקְרָא LXX *ὅτι ὕψωσα τὴν φωνήν μου καὶ ἐβόησα* (where, by the alteration introduced by *ὅτι* with the indicative, the change of construction is somewhat disguised: elsewhere, by rendering literally, LXX have distorted the real sense of the original, e. g. Ps. xcii. 8. cv. 12 f. *ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς . . . καὶ διῆλθον*). Now, under what circumstances do the partcp. and infin. break off into the *perfect* with וְ, and into the *imperfect* with וַ respectively? The answer to this question will be found to be in strict accordance with what we know already concerning the nature of the two constructions. Wherever the partcp. or infin. asserts something indefinite or undetermined—wherever, therefore, it may be resolved into *whoever*, *wherever*, *whenever* etc. (*ὅς ἂν* not *ὅς*, *ἐπειδὰν* not *ἐπειδή* etc.)—we find the *perfect* with וְ *conv.* employed: where, on the contrary, the partcp. or infin. asserts an actual concrete event, we find the following verbs connected with it by the *imperfect* and וַ.

Thus Ex. xxi. 12 מַכֵּה אִישׁ וָמֵת whoever smites a man *and he dies*, 16. Num. xix. 13[1]. Is. v. 23[1]. Jer. xxi. 9 he that goeth out וְנפל *and falleth*. Ezek. xxxiii. 30. Amos ii. 7[1]. vi. 5. viii. 14. Mic. iii. 5. Hab. ii. 12. Job vi. 14 al.

But וַ of a *fact*:—Gen. xxxv. 3 who answered me וַיהִי

[1] In these passages the verb is separated from וְ, and consequently in the imperfect.

and was with me. xlix. 17. Num. xxii. 11 (cf. 5). Is. xxix. 15 those who hide deeply their counsel וַיֹּאמְרוּ *and say*, 21. xxx. 2[1]. xliii. 7[1]. lvii. 3 etc. Amos vi. 3, 5[1], 6. ix. 5 (וַתָּמוֹג 'who touches the earth and it melts'—an attribute conceived definitely: what follows in pff. is a remoter indefinite consequence), 6. Ps. xv. 3[1]. xviii. 33. lxvi. 9[1] etc.

Sometimes, however, the tense retains a special significance, particularly when separated from וְ: thus the impf. is often a true frequentative, Ex. xxxiv. 7. Is. xxix. 21. xliv. 25–27. Amos vi. 6. Ps. xviii. 49 etc.

Occasionally we have וְ with the impf.: 2 Sam. v. 8. Ezek. xiii. 11. Dan. xii. 12.

Obs. It is evident that in characterizing a person or class of persons, a writer may either speak of them as actually exhibiting an attribute—perhaps with a distinct case before his mind—or else merely view them as *likely* or *apt* to exhibit it. Cf., for instance, Amos v. 7, 8, 12 with vi. 1, or Jer. xxiii. 31 f. with xxii. 13 f.

118. The distinction will be more conspicuous in the case of the infinitive: Gen. xviii. 25 וְהָיָה . . . לְהָמִית. Ex. i. 16. xxxiii. 16 בְּלֶכְתְּךָ וְנִפְלִינוּ *in* thy going (if thou goest) with us *and our being* separated from etc. Deut. xxx. 16 לָלֶכֶת . . . וְחָיִיתָ. 1 Sam. x. 8 *until* my coming וְהוֹדַעְתִּי *and* declaring (until I come and declare). 2 Sam. xiii. 28 כְּטוֹב . . . וְאָמַרְתִּי at the moment when Amnon's heart is merry *and I say*. 1 Kings ii. 37, 42. viii. 33 *when* they are smitten וְשָׁבוּ *and turn* (a hypothetical case), 35, 60 f. (למען דַּעַת . . . והיה). Is. xxix. 15 (לסתר והיה like Gen. xviii. 25). Ezek. iii. 20 *when* he turns וְעָשָׂה *and does* evil. v. 16 f. Job xxxvii. 15 etc. Amos i. 11 because he pursued . . . וְשִׁחֵת and (repeatedly) ruined mercy וַיִּטְרֹף *and so*

[1] Perfect, for the same reason.

his anger *goes on* to tear for ever (where the change of tense is peculiarly instructive).

Of course, as before, when separated from ו, the verb falls into the imperfect tense:—Ex. xxviii. 28. Josh. xx. 9. Is. x. 2 יִבְּזוּ . . . וְלִהְיוֹת. xlv. 1. xlix. 5. Ps. cv. 22 etc.: and with the *waw* omitted, Is. lxiv. 1 (ירגזו virtually governed by the ל in להודיע).

With these contrast Gen. xxxix. 18. Josh. viii. 24 וַיִּפְלוּ . . . כְּכַלּוֹת. 1 Kings xviii. 18 in thy forsaking וַהֲלֹךְ *and going* (definite acts extending into the present). Is. xlvii. 10 (ותבטחי after ש ברב v. 9). Ezek. xvi. 31, 34. xxv. 6 al. Ps. l. 16 what is it to thee לספר *to tell* my statutes וַתִּשָּׂא *and take* my covenant upon thy mouth? (two facts which have actually occurred: not 'that thou *shouldst* take,' וְנִשָּׂאתָ). xcii. 8. cv. 12 f. etc. Cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 18 על הדם ו . . . טמאוה because of the blood *and that* they have defiled her.

Obs. ימת 1 Sam. iv. 19 is very irregular, especially for the early Hebrew in which these books are written: Ezek. xiii. 8. xxii. 3 hardly justify it, as in these passages (if, indeed, the perfect be not an instance of the later usage: see next chapter) the verbs may well have a frequentative force. I do not see that any course is open except to restore וַיָּמָת: the LXX shew that our present Hebrew text of the books of Samuel is by no means free from corruptions and mistakes.

119. But the perfect with *waw conv.* is also found without being attached to any preceding verb from which to derive its special signification: like the iron which, after long contact with the magnet, becomes itself magnetic, the perfect with waw, from constant association with a preceding imperfect, became so completely invested with the properties of the latter that, though not originally belonging to it but only *acquired*, it still continued to retain and

exhibit them, even when that in which they had their proper seat was no longer itself present. We have already spoken of it as the *companion construction* of the imperfect: it has, in fact, grown so like its partner as to be able to assume its functions and act as its substitute. It may thus occur at the beginning of a sentence or after a verb which, unlike the 'dominant' verb, has no influence in determining the range of its meaning; the force it is then intended to convey must, as in the case of the imperfect, be gathered from the context: for although most commonly, perhaps, possessing the signification of a future, it must often be understood in one of the numerous other senses borne by the many-sided imperfect.

Thus (*a*) Gen. xvii. 4. xxvi. 22 now hath Yahweh made room for us וּפָרִינוּ *and* we *shall* be fruitful in the land. Ex. vi. 6 I am Yahweh; וְהוֹצֵאתִי *and I will bring you out* etc. Judg. xiii. 3 behold thou art barren and hast not borne; וְהָרִית *but thou shalt* conceive, and bear a son. 1 Sam. xv. 28 and *will* give it. xvii. 36, 47. xx. 18. Num. xxi. 8. Josh. ii. 14 והיה *and it shall* be, when etc. 1 Kings ii. 44 *and* Yahweh *will* requite. ix. 3 והיו *and* my eyes and heart *shall* be there. Is. vi. 7 see, this hath touched thy lips, וְסָר *and so* thy iniquity *shall pass away*. xxx. 3. Hos. viii. 14. x. 4, 14. xi. 6. Amos v. 26 (or, at any rate, 27). vi. 8.

Or to express what is not certain to happen, but is only probable, and so, perhaps, feared:—2 Sam. xiv. 7 *and* they *will* quench. Gen. xx. 11 there is no fear of God in this place, וְהָרְגוּ *and* they *will* kill me. xxxiv. 30: cf. 1 Kings xviii. 14 *b*.

(*β*) With the force of a positive command, usually in

the second person :—Num. iv. 4 f. this is the service of the sons of Qŏhâth וּבָא Aaron *shall* come and take down etc. Deut. x. 16, 19 ואהבתם *and* or *so* ye *shall* love the stranger. xxix. 8 ושמרתם *and ye shall* observe. Josh. xxii. 3 *b* (cf. 5). xxiii. 11. 2 Sam. xiv. 10 והבאתו *then* bring him to me. 2 Kings v. 6 (the following verses shew that the king of Israel understood וְאֲסַפְתִּוֹ as practically a *command* which could not very conveniently be declined : not, therefore, as 1 Sam. xx. 5). Jer. vii. 27. xxix. 26. Ezek. xxii. 2 wouldst thou judge, judge the bloody city? וְהוֹדַעְתָּהּ *then declare* unto her all her abominations. Zech. i. 3. Mal. ii. 15 f.

(γ) Sometimes it is interrogative :—Ex. v. 5 וְהִשְׁבַּתֶּם *and will ye*[1] stop them? Num. xvi. 10 (ה 9). 1 Sam. xxv. 11 וְלָקַחְתִּי *and shall I* take? 2 Kings xiv. 10 (2 Chron. xxv. 19). Is. lxvi. 9 am I he that causeth to bring forth וְעָצַרְתִּי *and shall* I shut up? (cf. the *impf.* ולא אוליד in *a* : the break in the sense before אמר אלהיך co-operates with the *ṭifcha* to keep the tone back, § 104). Mal. i. 2. ii. 14, 17. iii. 7, 8,

---

[1] This use of ו is completely parallel to the way in which *et* appears in Latin 'to subjoin an emphatic question or exclamation:' the force of ו Ex. v. 5. 1 Sam. xxv. 11 is exactly that of *et* Verg. Georg. ii. 433 (*and yet*, after and in spite of 429–432, *do men hesitate?* etc.). Aen. i. 48. vi. 806 etc. Compare further how ו is employed to introduce an impassioned speech, without anything *expressed* previously to which it can be attached. Num. xx. 3 ולו *And* if we had only perished with our brethren! 2 Sam. xviii. 11 והנה, 12. xxiv. 3. 2 Kings i. 10 (but 12, אם alone). vii. 19 (sarcastic: yet cf. 2). Is. xxxvi. 19 *And* that they could have delivered Samaria out of my hand! (2 Kings xviii. 34, without ו). So before מי, 1 Sam. x. 12. Judg. ix. 29. Num. xi. 29; and very often before למה or מדוע. Also in a peremptory expression of the will, 2 Kings v. 6. x. 2.

13. Ps. l. 21 ('and shall I keep silence?' Hitz.: tone as xxviii. 1 after פן). 1 Chron. xvii. 17 and wilt thou regard me?

(δ) In entreaty or suggestion, as a precative or mild imperative:—Gen. xxiv. 14 והיה *may* it be that . . . (possibly under the influence of the imperatives, *v.* 12). xlvii. 23 *sow then.* Deut. xxx. 19 behold I set before thee life and death, ובחרת *so choose* life. Judg. vi. 36 f. if there is dew upon the fleece וידעתי *then let me* know. xi. 8. 1 Sam. xx. 5. xxiv. 5 וְעָשִׂיתָ, 16. xxv. 27 ונתנה, 30. 1 Kings ii. 6 ועשית *do therefore* according to thy wisdom. iii. 9. viii. 28. Ps. xxv. 11 for thy name's sake וְסָלַחְתָּ *so pardon* or *pardon then* my iniquity! Ruth iii. 3, 9 I am Ruth ופרשת *so pray spread* etc.

And with נָא added:—Gen. xl. 14 but if thou remember-est me when it is well with thee, וְעָשִׂיתָ־נָּא *then shew,* I pray, mercy etc.; and with the נא thrown back into a preceding protasis (to indicate as early as possible the 'petitionary' character of the speech) in the formula אִם־נָא מָצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ, Gen. xxxiii. 10. Judg. vi. 17 (cf. the jussive or imperative alone, Gen. xviii. 3. xlvii. 29. l. 4. Ex. xxxiii. 13: Gen. xxx. 27 the perfect obviously does nothing more than assert a fact).

120. But the most noticeable use of the perfect and *waw conv.*, though the one least likely to attract attention, is *as a frequentative.* After the list of instances in § 113. 4 the reader will find no difficulty in recognising this force in the perfect and *waw* after a preceding dominant imperfect: but where no such imperfect precedes, it will irresistibly occur to him to ask why the *waw* may not be simply copulative instead of 'conversive;' the more so, inasmuch as owing to the verbs being almost always

in the third person, the crucial change of tone cannot take place? Why, he will not unreasonably ask, why should it be asserted that וְשָׁפְטוּ Ex. xviii. 26 means *and used to judge*, when the obvious and natural rendering seems to be simply *and judged?* why seek to import a far-fetched and improbable sense into such a plain combination of verb and conjunction?

The answer to such objections will be found in the manner in which the perfect and waw thus appears. In the first place, it does not occur *promiscuously:* it is not intermingled with the construction with וְ in equal proportions, but is commonly found thickly sprinkled *over detached areas* (e. g. 1 Sam. vii. 16). Now when a writer abandons a construction which he employs in nine cases out of ten in favour of another, and that, too, under the peculiar circumstances just described, it is, at least, reasonable to infer that he means *something* by the change. In the second place, our knowledge that the perfect with *waw conv.* follows the imperfect as a frequentative, coupled with the analogy presented by its use in the last §, raises the suspicion that it may possibly have the same value even when no imperfect precedes. This suspicion is strengthened by the fact that it is constantly found *in company with a bare imperfect*, even though not actually preceded by it. In the passage from Exodus, for example, ושפטו is immediately followed by יביאון and ישפטו: if, then, these verbs are frequentative (as they clearly are), ושפטו must be so too. It is inconceivable that a coincidence of this sort should be accidental: it is inconceivable that in a multitude of passages the change from וְ to the perfect and waw (in itself a striking variation) should take place *concurrently with* another change,

that, viz. from the perfect (which, as we know, § 85, is the regular alternative for וַ·) to the imperfect, without the existence of some common cause accounting for both: but the reason why the imperfect is chosen is patent, it must, therefore, have been the same reason which determined the choice of the perfect and waw. Having once vindicated for this idiom a frequentative force, we shall not hesitate to adopt it in cases where no imperfect follows to precipitate our decision. And the conclusive change of tone in Jer. vi. 17 is a final confirmation of the justice of our reasoning.

Thus Gen. xxx. 41 f. (cf. ישים 42). Ex. xvii. 11 והיה and it was *whenever* ירים he raised up his hand, ונבר Israel prevailed. xviii. 26 (cf. יביאון). xl. 31 f. (cf. ירחצו).

Judg. ii. 18 f. וְהָיָה, וְהוֹשִׁיעָם (cf. יִנָּחֵם). 1 Sam. i. 4 וגתן (cf. יתן 5), 6 *a* (the account of the particular occasion which is the subject of the narrative begins ותכעסה 7 *b*). 2 Sam. xii. 31. xiv. 26. xvii. 17 (the *narrative* recommences ויראו 18, with וַ· just as Gen. xxix. 4. 1 Sam. i. 7). 1 Kings iv. 7. v. 7 וְכִלְכְּלוּ (cf. *b* לא יעדרו).

Gen. xlvii. 22 ואכלו. 1 Sam. i. 3. vii. 16. xiii. 21 f. xvi. 23. 2 Sam. xv. 2, 5 (the *succession* of pff. in most of these passages is very striking). 1 Kings ix. 25 והעלה *used* to offer (notice the words *three times a year*). xviii. 4 *b* וכלכלם (plainly a *repeated* act, exactly as v. 7). 2 Kings iii. 4 וְהֵשִׁיב, LXX rightly ἐπέστρεφε. Jer. vi. 17 והקימתי (observe the tone) *and I kept raising up* over you watchmen.

Obs. There is one place in the Old Testament where the appearance of this idiom is so curious and interesting as to merit special notice. Throughout the whole of the first fourteen chapters of the book of Joshua, though entirely devoted to historical narrative, the nature of the events described is such as not to give opportunity for the use of the perfect and waw except on *three* occasions:—Josh. vi.

8 and 13 in the account of the blowing of the trumpets during the day's march round Yᵉrîcho (an act which would obviously involve *repetition*), and ix. 12, where the waw is not conversive but simply copulative, according to § 132: except in these three passages, the narrative is *exclusively* carried on by means of ·וַ, alternating, at times, with the bare perfect. Suddenly, upon arriving at chap. xv (in which the history proceeds to delineate the course taken by the boundaries of the various tribes), the reader is startled by finding *vv.* 3–11 a succession of *perfects* connected by *waw* (ויצא, ועבר, ועלה etc.). What can be the object of the change? In the teeth of the constant usage in the preceding portion of the book, it is highly improbable that the perfect and waw should be a *mere* alternative for ·וַ: and its known meaning elsewhere affords a strong presumption that here, too, it has a frequentative force, descriptive of the course which the boundary *used to take—used to take,* namely (not, as though a participle, *continuously took*), whenever any one passed along it or examined it. Let us see whether there is anything to confirm this presumption. After a break, xv. 13–63, in which other matters are related, xvi. 1 states how the lot fell for the children of Joseph, *v.* 2 proceeds to describe their boundaries, and the *perfect* at once reappears, continuing as far as the end of *v.* 3. Here follows another break; but *v.* 6 the perfect is again resumed till we reach *v.* 8, where the presumption we had formed is triumphantly corroborated. *In v.* 8 *the imperfect,* the constant companion of the perfect with waw conv., *makes its appearance:* יֵלֵךְ, the force of which cannot be mistaken, vindicates and establishes for all the neighbouring and preceding perfects with waw, the frequentative sense assigned to them above. Nor is this all. In xvii. 9 we have the perfect again: *v.* 10 we have the attendant impf. יסבעון. By the side of the long series of perfects and waw xviii. 12–21, we find *v.* 20 and the Jordan יגבול *used to bound* it on the east: with *v.* 21 והיו of *cities,* cf. xxi. 40 תהיינה similarly used. On the contrary, xix. 11–14, 22, 26–29, 34 present no case of an imperfect: but we shall not on that account feel any hesitation in supposing that, as before, a frequentative signification is still intended to be conveyed[1]. (In xix. 29 Kt. 33 *b*, we have ·וַ, according to § 114: cf. the perfect, *vv.* 13, 34 *b*.)

---

[1] I did not cite יהיה xv. 4 *b*, because in our text the second person

121. In the same way that we saw ויהי employed, § 78, in reference to the past, we find its counterpart וְהָיָה used in a *future* or *frequentative* sense: the thread of the narrative, after the termination of the adverbial clause, being most commonly resumed by another perfect with *waw conv.*, but sometimes also by the bare imperfect.

Examples of its use in the former signification:—Is. xiv. 3 f. וְהָיָה בַיּוֹם . . . וְנָשָׂאתָ *and it shall be*, in the day when etc. *and* (=*that*) *thou shalt take up* this proverb. xvi. 2 וְהָיָה . . . תִּהְיֶינָה; and often, especially in the prophets: cf. 1 Kings xviii. 24.

As a frequentative:—Gen. xxxviii. 9. Num. xxi. 9. Judg. vi. 3 וְהָיָה אִם זָרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעָלָה מִדְיָן *and it used to happen*, when Israel had sown, *that* the Midianites *used to* (or *would*) come up. xix. 30; and breaking off into an impf., Ex. xxxiii. 7, 8, 9 וְהָיָה כְּבֹא מֹשֶׁה הָאֹהֱלָה יֵרֵד *and it used to be*, when Moses entered into the Tent, the pillar of cloud *would come down*. Judg. ii. 19.

Obs. On four occasions, 1 Sam. x. 5. 2 Sam. v. 24 (1 Chron. xiv. 15). Ruth iii. 4. 1 Kings xiv. 5 *b*, where we might have expected והיה, we find וְיִהִי. It is impossible to dismiss this so unconcernedly as is done by Ewald, § 345 *b*: either ויהי must be a mere copyist's

---

לכם follows, which necessitates the rendering *shall be*. It can hardly be doubted, however, that לכם is an error for להם: which might easily arise from a copyist imagining the preceding verbs to express a command, and so to be addressed to Judah in the *second* person. But there is no indication that either the whole passage or even this single clause has such a sense, which indeed is quite out of harmony with the context: and in the rest of the list, whenever any pronoun appears, it is regularly that of the third person. LXX also have *αὐτῶν*: so that יהיה must certainly be added to the instances given in the text.

error, or some definite explanation must be found for the adoption of so unusual a form: observe how in 1 Sam. ויהי is followed within a few verses by two instances of the customary והיה. In the first three passages, at any rate, the verb has the force of a legitimate jussive: יהי is simply prefixed to the adverbial clause in the same manner as וַיְהִי and והיה. Thus 1 Sam. *and let it be* (a permissive edict, issued through the medium of the prophet; cf. 2 Kings ii. 10), when thou goest into the city and meetest (after כבא, § 118: for the *co-ordination* of the two clauses, cf. p. 148 *Obs.*) a band of prophets . . . וצלחה *that* the spirit of Yahweh *fall* upon thee etc.: 2 Sam. the sentence is resumed by a second jussive: Ruth iii. *and let it be*, when he lieth down, *and observe* (or *that thou* observe) the place where he lieth. In 1 Kings *and it shall be*, Auth. Vers., for ויהי is quite out of the question: for how could a mere piece of information have been ever expressed by a *jussive?* We must then either correct והיה, or suppose that some words have dropped out: the sentence reads as though it were incomplete, and והיא מתנכרה suggests irresistibly the idea that it must be a 'circumstantial clause' (see App. I). If we assume that some such words as ואמרת אליה למה זה את מתנכרה (cf. *v.* 6) have fallen out, the jussive ויהי is at once explained, an appropriate sense is obtained (*and let it be*, when she enters in disguised, *that thou say* etc.), and the cause of the omission becomes plain in the *ὁμοιοτέλευτον* מתנכרה. Compare Böttcher.

122. We have already had occasion to call attention to the *demonstrative* force of the conjunction *waw;* and in several of the passages cited in § 119 this meaning displayed itself undisguisedly. Certainly the וְ did not there indicate a *formal* consequence, as when followed by the voluntative (Chap. V): but a *material* consequence conceived as arising out of, or suggested by, the situation described in the preceding words was none the less clearly intimated. E. g. Ruth iii. 9 the petition וּפָרַשְׂתָּ is plainly based upon the relation borne by the speaker towards Bo'az, as expressed in the words *I am Ruth:* and the *waw* may fairly be rendered by 'so,' 'then,'

'*itaque*[1].' It is but a stronger instance of the same demonstrative usage when, as will have now to be explained, ו is employed in certain cases in order to introduce the *predicate*, or, more often, the *apodosis*.

Obs. The relation subsisting between the copulative conjunction and demonstrative roots can be illustrated from Greek and Latin. Of *καὶ* Curtius *Grundzüge der Griech. Etymol.* No. 27, p. 128 ed. 2 writes, 'The form appears to be the Locative of a pronominal stem *κα, κο* (cf. Lith. *kai*, how?), which has here preserved its demonstrative signification. From the same stem springs *τε* with *τ* for *κ*' (on this change see *ibid.* pp. 426 ff., and cf. *τίς* with *quis*, *τέσσαρες* with *quatuor*, Sk. *chatvâras* etc.): in *-que*, on the contrary, as in Sk. *cha*, the guttural is retained. On this stem *cha* (from which *ποῦ; πότε;* Ion. *κοῦ; κότε;* etc. *who, where, whether* etc. are derived), Curtius remarks further, p. 410, 'The earliest use of the stem *ka* was probably, like that of all the pronominal stems, as a demonstrative. It is preserved in the Locative *ἐ-κεῖ*, with which *-ce* [as in *illi-c* etc.], Lat. *cis, ci-tra* must be compared.' In a similar way *δὲ* (cf. *δή*, *ὅ-δε*), if not *et* (cf. *ἔτι*), is probably to be explained: see pp. 560 f., 188. Upon this view *ἄνδρες τε θεοί τε* literally means '*there* men, *there* gods,' i. e. both together = '*both* men *and* gods.' And the theory derives a striking confirmation from Latin, where we are in fact able to watch the transition from the demonstrative to the copulative signification taking place beneath our eyes. *Tum* unquestionably means *then:* but in such a sentence as '*tum* homines, *tum* equi aderant' (the structure of which exactly resembles that of *ἄνδρες τε θεοί τε*) we see it possessing virtually a copulative force,—literally '*then* men, *then* horses were there,' i. e. they were both there together = '*both* horses *and* men were there.'

[1] Compare further, in connection with this use of ו, Gen. xxvii. 8 ועתה *νῦν οὖν*. Ex. ii. 20 ואיו *and* where is he? (or, where is he *then*?) 1 Sam. xxvi. 22 ויעבר *so* let one of the young men come near. 2 Sam. xviii. 22 ויהי מה *well*, come what may. 2 Kings iv. 41 וקחו fetch meal then! vii. 13. xviii. 23. 2 Chron. xviii. 12 ויהי *so* let thy word, I pray, be like one of theirs (1 Kings xxii. 13 יהי only). Is. xlvii. 9 וחבאנה (*v.* 11 ובא). Ps. iv. 4 ודעו *know then.* Cf. Il. xxiii. 75 *καί μοι δδε τὴν χεῖρα.*

Without assuming that the Hebrew ו had once a distinctly demonstrative force, it does not appear possible to explain or account for the phenomena which its use actually presents. Starting from a meaning not stronger than that of our modern *and*, we do not readily perceive how such a weak word as ו must then have been, could ever stand in the emphatic positions it really occupies: starting on the other hand with a *demonstrative* signification, we at once comprehend, even without the aid of the Aryan analogies, and especially, because best attested, the Latin *tum*, by what steps this might become merely copulative. If the latter view be correct, *three* different modes present themselves in which it is employed; the first, comprising those cases in which the stronger and more decided sense is still evidently retained; the second (the *waw conv.* generally, but more particularly with the *perfect*), comprising those in which the earlier meaning has to be assumed (see p. 129) in order to explain the usage, but where the conscious recollection of it was probably as much forgotten in practice by the ancient Hebrew as it is disregarded by the modern reader in translation; the third, comprising the instances in which its force is equivalent to that of the copulative conjunction—'the heavens, *then* the earth,' being identical with 'the heavens *and* the earth.' The Arabic language possesses two forms of the copulative, فَ *fa* as well as وَ *wa:* the latter being the *mere* copulative, the former carrying the stronger meaning *then, so, οὖν* etc., and being employed generally in all those cases which correspond to the *first* class just mentioned. It lies near to conjecture that both *wa* and *fa* (cf. the Heb. אַף) are but modifications of the same original labial stem, that in Arabic the two words once existed side by side as by-forms, but that, in process of time, a differentiation was effected, in consequence of which *fa* was reserved for emphatic occasions, while in Hebrew *fa* as such fell out of use, and the single form *wa* had to do double duty. And that a demonstrative signification is not foreign to the syllable *fa*, is plain from the adverbs פֹּה *here*, אֵיפֹה *where?* (formed from פֹּה, like אֵי־זֶה from זֶה), אֲפוֹ or אֲפוֹא *then, so, ὅῃ*. Upon the whole, then, we seem fully justified in assigning a *demonstrative* origin to the Semitic ו: the conclusion suggested, if not necessitated, by the usages of Hebrew syntax receiving independent confirmation from the analogies offered by the Aryan family of speech.

123. Accordingly וְ is frequently found placed before the verb in cases where the subject or object is prefixed; or where, the logical subject or object being prefixed, the place they would ordinarily occupy is filled grammatically by either a suffix or a fresh substantive.

(*a*) Gen. xvii. 14. Ex. ix. 19 all the men who are found in the field, וְיָרַד the hail *shall come down* upon them. xii. 15, 44 every slave וּמַלְתָּה אֹתוֹ *thou shalt* circumcise (lit. (as regards) every slave, *so* thou shalt circumcise him). xxi. 13. xxx. 33, 38. xxxi. 14 *b* every one that doeth any work in it, וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא *that soul shall be* cut off; and so frequently. Deut. xvii. 12. xviii. 20. 1 Sam. xxv. 27. Is. ix. 4. lvi. 4 f. וְנָתַתִּי, 6 f. והביאותים. lxv. 7 your iniquities . . ., וּמַדַּדְתִּי *I will mete out* their reward. Jer. xxiii. 34 etc. Prov. ix. 16 (freq., cf. וישבה *v.* 14: *v.* 4 the construction is different).

(*β*) After various time-determinations:—Gen. iii. 5 in the day of your eating from it, וְנִפְקְחוּ your eyes *will be* opened. Ex. iv. 21. xvi. 6 f. עֶרֶב וִידַעְתֶּם at even—*then* ye will know. xxxii. 34. Lev. xxvi. 26. Num. x. 10. xviii. 30 *b*. Deut. iv. 30. 2 Sam. xi. 20. 1 Kings xiii. 31 when I die, וּקְבַרְתֶּם *ye shall bury* me by the man of God. xiv. 12. Ezek. xviii. 13, 24 וָחָי *shall he live?* Is. xviii. 5 וכרת: after the phrase הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים, 1 Sam. ii. 31 behold days are coming וְגָדַעְתִּי *and I will cut off* thy seed. 2 Kings xx. 17 (Is. xxxix. 6). Amos viii. 11. ix. 13, and often in Jeremiah (the expression does not occur elsewhere): after עוֹד מְעַט, as Ex. xvii. 4 a little while וּסְקָלֻנִי *and they will* stone me. Is. x. 25. xxix. 17. Jer. li. 33 (יָבֹאָה, § 112. 5) etc.; cf. Is. xvi. 14. xxi. 16. Prov. vi. 10 f.[1] Compare also

[1] Cf. 2 Chron. x. 5, where we have the imperative ושובו after עוד;

Prov. xxiv. 27 אַחַר וּבְנִיתָ afterwards, *and* (or *then*) thou shalt build thy house: Ps. cxli. 6 is probably only an extreme instance of the same construction.

And without any verb following:—Is. xvii. 14. Ps. xxxvii. 10.

In a frequentative signification:—Gen. xxxi. 8 וילדו *then they used* to bear. Ex. i. 19 *b*. xxxvi. 38? Num. ix. 19. 1 Sam. ii. 15 when any one sacrificed וּבָא the young man *used to come* (cf. יקח, יעשו 14), 15 LXX excellently πρὶν θυμιαθῆναι τὸ στέαρ ἤρχετο τὸ παιδάριον καὶ ἔλεγε. xvii. 20 וְהִרְעִ. Is. xliv. 12[1] ופעל (observe following יצרהו).

(γ) After other words as אֲשֶׁר (whoso):—Gen. xliv. 9 וּמֵת (10 in a similar sentence, the impf. יהיה). Lev. iv. 22. Judg. i. 12 whoever smites Qiryath-Sepher וְנָתַתִּי *I will give him* 'Akhsah my daughter; מָרַם Is. lxvi. 7 *b* (*a* without וְ, the instantaneous perfect, § 136 γ); יָשַׁן, 1 Kings xx. 28 because they have said . . . וְנָתַתִּי *I will give* etc., 42. 2 Kings xix. 28. Is. iii. 16 f. Jer. vii. 13 f.; כִּי since or because, Gen. xxix. 15; עָקַב, Num. xiv. 24; תָּחַת, Deut. iv. 37–39 וַיִּרְעָם. 2 Kings xxii. 17 וְנִצַּתָה (in 2 Chron.

---

but in 1 Kings xii. 5 לכו is added before עד, which LXX read likewise in 2 Chron.

[1] Unless, as the harshness of the present text itself suggests, we suppose that a verb has dropped out at the beginning of the verse: LXX insert ὤξυνεν, Pesh. ܡܫܚܪ. Delitzsch proposes חִדֵּד, Cheyne (Notes and Criticisms on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah, 1868) still better הֵחֵד, which might easily drop out from similarity with the preceding יחד. But why did not the latter go further and adopt יַחַד itself, as in Prov. xxvii. 17, or, if the jussive form be objected to, יַחֵד or יָחַד? In that case not only is there perfect identity with the last word of *v.* 11, but the *tense* accords far better with the two verbs following: we obtain for 12 *a* three frequentatives, which naturally go together (וַ 12 *b*, § 114 β).

xxxiv. 25 וַתִּתַּךְ—probably corrupt, as LXX both there and *v.* 21 use *ἐκκαίω*: if retained, וַתִּתַּךְ, see § 127, will still introduce the apodosis, but will indicate that the speaker viewed the outpouring as *having already* (ideally or really) *commenced*). Is. lx. 15; and constantly after כִּי and אִם, Is. xxviii. 18 etc.: see Chap. X, §§ 136–138.

Obs. In all these cases the impf. alone might have been used, the only advantage of the pf. with וְ being that it marks the apodosis more clearly, and by separating the initial words (the subject or protasis) from those which follow renders them more emphatic. Frequently, indeed, we meet with the two forms in close proximity to each other: see Gen. xliv. 9 and 10. Judg. viii. 7 and 9. Ezek. xxxiii. 18 and 19; and cf. Gen. xl. 13 with Is. xxi. 16, Ex. xii. 15. Num. xix. 11 with Gen. iv. 15.

124. If the וְ becomes separated from the verb, the latter naturally appears in the impf.: this, however, is altogether a rare[1] occurrence.

After הֵן or הִנֵּה:—Ex. viii. 22 וְלֹא will they not stone us? (where הֲלֹא might have been expected). 1 Sam. ix. 7 וּמַה. 2 Chron. vii. 13 f. וְאִנִּי; Ex. xxv. 9, cf. Num. ix. 17; Lev. vii. 16 on the morrow, *then* etc. Num. xix. 12. xxx. 9. xxxv. 6. Deut. xv. 12. Josh. iii. 3 (but no וְ appears in the similar injunction 8 *b*). 1 Sam. xxiv. 20. 1 Kings viii. 32, 34, 36, 39 (omitted 43). Is. lvii. 12. lxv. 24 (after טֶרֶם, and also a partcp. with עוֹד). Jer. vii. 32. Ezek. v. 11. Amos v. 22. Zech. iii. 7 (Hitz.). Ps. cxv. 7 (different from 5 f.). Prov. iii. 34. xx. 21. Job viii. 12. xxiii. 12. xxv. 5.

The וְ is followed by a *perfect*, Ruth iv. 5 thou *wilt have*

---

[1] The instances given will perhaps *seem* to be disproportionately numerous as compared with those in § 123: but in § 123 I have given only a *selection*, whereas here I have quoted almost all that are to be found.

purchased (for וּמֵאֵת should we not read גַּם אֵת, as in *v.* 10?). Job xxxv. 15; and by a *participle*, Jon. iii. 4. Hag. ii. 6.

125. Sometimes further, though still more rarely, we have וְ closely joined to the *imperfect*:—Ex. xii. 3 in the tenth day of the month וְיִקְחוּ. Num. xvi. 5 in the morning וְיֵדַע Yahweh will shew. 1 Sam. xxx. 22 *b*. Is. xix. 20 וישלח. xliii. 4. Jer. viii. 1 Kt. xiii. 10. Ezek. xxxiii. 31. Hos. x. 10. Ps. lxix. 33. xci. 14 (unless כי=*for*). Prov. i. 29–31 ויאכלו. Job xv. 17 that which I have seen, וְאַסַּפְּרָה *let me tell it*. Esth. v. 3.

Obs. Compare the cases in which the predicate or apodosis *without a verb* is introduced in the same way:—Gen. xl. 9, 16 בחלומי והנה. 2 Sam. xv. 34 thy father's slave, ואני מאז I was *that* before; but now, ואני עבדך *now* I am thine! xxiii. 3 f. *when one ruleth* over men justly—*ruleth* in the fear of God, וכאור *then* is it like the shining of the morn at sunrise. Job iv. 6. xxxvi. 26 *b*. Prov. x. 25 *a* when a tempest passes by ואין רשע *then* the wicked is not. 1 Chron. xxviii. 21. Gen. xx. 16 *b*. Cf. too 2 Sam. xxii. 41 (which differs from Ps. xviii. 41 exactly as Prov. xxiii. 24 *b* Kt. does from Qri): the misplacement of ן in *one* of the two texts would be parallel to that which we are almost obliged to assume Ps. xvi. 3.

126. A special case of this use of the perfect with *waw conv.* is when it is preceded by a *partcp.*, which is then often introduced by הִנֵּה.

Thus with הנה:—1 Kings xx. 36 הִנְּךָ הוֹלֵךְ . . . וְהִכְּךָ behold thou art going from me and a lion will smite thee (=*as* thou goest from me, a lion *will* etc.). Judg. vii. 17. ix. 33 (*as* he comes out, thou shalt etc.: Vulg. excellently *illo autem egrediente* . . . fac ei quod potueris). Ex. viii. 25. 1 Sam. xiv. 8–10. Ezek. xiv. 22: Gen. xxiv. 14 (here, as 1 Kings ii. 2, the verb rather expresses a *wish* or *hope*, § 119 δ). Josh. xxiii. 14: Gen. xlviii. 21 (l. 24 the verb is separated from וְ and so lapses into the impf.).

Without הנה :—1 Kings ii. 2. xviii. 11 f., 14. 2 Kings vii. 9 וְאַנַחְנוּ מַחְשִׁים *and if* we are silent and wait (pf. as § 117) וּמְצָאָנוּ iniquity will find us out (*si tacuerimus* Vulg.). Prov. xxix. 9, cf. 21; of past time, 1 Sam. ii. 13 (freq.).

The same use of the partcp. appears likewise with the impf. alone in apodosis:—

Josh. ii. 18 behold *as* (or *when*) *we come* אֶת תִּקְוַת חוּט תִּקְשְׁרִי thou shalt bind this thread on to the window (ingredientibus nobis). Num. xxiv. 14. Ex. xxxiv. 10. Gen. l. 5. Ex. iii. 13 behold אָנֹכִי בָא וְאָמַרְתִּי *if I go* and say (§ 117) . . ., and they say, What is his name? (here comes the apodosis) *what* shall I say to them? cf. too 1 Sam. xvi. 15 f.; and with an imperative or participle in apodosis, Gen. xlix. 29. Ex. ix. 17.

Obs. The subordinate position which in almost all these instances the first or participial clause holds in the sentence—assigning usually the justification or reason for what follows—warrants our treating and translating the participle as a genitive or ablative absolute: indeed, passages like those last cited, where וְ is absent, forbid our rendering it in any other way.

127. Similarly, though with not nearly the same frequency as the opposite construction, we find וְ employed to introduce the predicate or the apodosis, the cases in which the latter is chosen to the exclusion of the former being regulated by the same principles which we have already so frequently seen exemplified. In other words, וְ is used of what is past or certain rather than of what is future or indefinite[1].

(*a*) With subject prefixed:—Gen. xxii. 24. xxx. 30 for the little that thou hadst before I came, וַיִּפְרֹץ *it* hath

[1] Nearly all the instances are cited.

increased etc. Ex. ix. 21. xxxviii. 24. Num. xiv. 36 f. וימתו (with repetition of the subject האנשים). 1 Sam. xiv. 19 וילך. 2 Sam. xix. 41 Kt. xxi. 16. 1 Kings xi. 26. 2 Kings ii. 14 *b*. Is. ix. 11. Jer. xliv. 25. Ps. cvii. 13 (the subject of ויזעקו being ישבי חשך 10). 2 Chron. xxv. 13.

With the subject preceded by ויהי:—Num. ix. 6. 1 Sam. x. 11. xi. 11 *b* וַיְהִי הַנִּשְׁאָרִים וַיִּפָּצוּ and it came to pass, (as regards) those that remained, *that* they were scattered. 2 Sam. ii. 23 ויעמדו.

With object or 'casus pendens' prefixed:—2 Sam. iv. 10 for he that told me saying, Saul is dead, וְאֹחֲזֶה בּוֹ I took hold of him etc. 1 Kings xv. 13. 2 Kings xvi. 14. xxv. 22. Jer. vi. 19 because to my words they have not attended, and my law וּמְאַסְרֻבָהּ they have despised it. xxviii. 8. xxxiii. 24. Job xxxvi. 7. Dan. i. 20. Neh. x. 28. 1 Chron. xxviii. 5. 2 Chron. viii. 8. x. 17.

(β) After time-determinations:—Gen. xxii. 4 on the third day וַיִּשָּׂא Abraham lifted up his eyes (=*it was* on the third day *that* Abraham lifted up his eyes: cf. 1 Chron. xvi. 7, where אז is similarly introduced). Dan. i. 18. 2 Chron. xxv. 27: so after ב, Num. vii. 89. xii. 12. Judg. xi. 16. 1 Sam. xvii. 24. 2 Kings xxv. 3. Is. vi. 1. Ezek. xx. 5. Ps. cxxxviii. 3. 1 Chron. xxi. 28. 2 Chron. xiii. 1. xxviii. 22; בטרם, Gen. xxxvii. 18; כ, Gen. xxvii. 34. 1 Sam. iv. 20. xvii. 57. Hos. xiii. 1, 6. Esth. v. 9; כאשר, Ex. xvi. 34. 1 Sam. vi. 6. xii. 8; כמו, Gen. xix. 15; כי *when*, Josh. xxii. 7. Hos. xi. 1. Ps. l. 18.

(γ) After other words:—Num. xiv. 16. 1 Sam. xv. 23 *because* thou hast rejected Yahweh וַיִּמְאָסְךָ *he* has rejected thee. Hos. iv. 6. 2 Chron. xxiv. 20 *b*. 1 Kings x. 9. Is. xlv. 4. xlviii. 4, 18 (ויהי may, however, belong to the protasis, which would then end, as frequently, in an aposio-

pesis: in that case the construction would be exactly parallel to Josh. vii. 7 *b*). Ezek. xvi. 47. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 25 (see 2 Kings xxii. 17, and above, § 123 γ); after אִם, Ps. lix. 16. Job viii. 4[1].

128. When the verb is separated from וְ, the pf. tense reappears:—Gen. xix. 4. Judg. xi. 26 while Israel dwelt in Heshbon etc. three hundred years וּמַדּוּעַ לֹא הִצַּלְתֶּם *pray* why did you not deliver them during that time? 2 Kings vi. 32 (והוא אמר as Gen. xix. 4). Is. xlviii. 7 before to-day, וְלֹא שָׁמַעְתָּם thou hast not heard them. Ps. lxxviii. 30 f. (cf. Num. xi. 33). Job i. 16–18. Esth. vi. 14. Dan. x. 4, 9. 2 Chron. v. 13. vii. 1.

Where, under these circumstances, the *imperfect* appears, it has some special force, as Gen. ii. 4 (because of מרם). Num. ix. 17 (freq.). 1 Kings x. 28.

129. In the few isolated cases where the *perfect* with וְ is found in relation to the past or present, it is either frequentative (§ 123 β), or else wholly exceptional:—2 Kings xi. 1 Kt. Ex. xxxvi. 38. Is. xxxvii. 26. Jer. xl. 3 *b*. Ezek. xvi. 19.

---

[1] But xix. 18 will be most safely and naturally explained by § 54 or 84, and for xxx. 26 see p. 66 *note:* it is too precarious to suppose that the וְ should mark here, as it marks nowhere else, the apodosis to a hypothetical voluntative, §§ 150–152.

In the Hebrew translation of the New Testament, published by the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews (London 1867), the construction with וְ is employed in answer to כאשר etc. with much greater frequency and freedom than is accorded to themselves by any of the Old Testament historians.

CHAPTER IX.

The Perfect and Imperfect with Weak Waw.

130. It will appear to the reader almost ludicrous to devote a separate chapter to the consideration of what will seem to be such an elementary phenomenon of language as the union of either the perfect or the imperfect with the simple conjunction וְ. Yet, common and constant as this union is in the case of the other Semitic languages, in Hebrew, especially so far as the *perfect* is concerned, it is such a rare and isolated occurrence as both to invite and demand a somewhat minute investigation.

131. Although in Hebrew the continuation of a historical narrative is most usually expressed by the impf. with וַ, we find, occasionally in the earlier books of the Old Testament, and with increasing frequency in the later ones, that this idiom, which is so peculiarly and distinctively a creation of the Hebrew language, has been replaced by the *perfect* with the simple or weak *waw*, וְ. Generally, indeed, as we saw in the last chapter, and invariably when the verb to which the perfect is annexed is a bare imperfect, §§ 113. 4, 120, the *waw* prefixed to the perfect is conversive, and the sense consequently frequen-

tative: but a certain number of passages exist in which this signification is out of place; in these, therefore, we are compelled to suppose that the *waw* is the *mere* copulative, and that it no longer exerts over the following verb that strong and peculiar modifying influence which we term conversive. There are two principal cases in which the perfect with weak *waw* is thus met with. The feature common to them both is this—that the idiom employed, instead of representing a given event as *arising out of*, or *being a continuation of*, some previous occurrence (in the manner of the idiom with וְ), represents it as standing on an independent ground of its own, as connected indeed with what precedes, but only externally and superficially, without any inner bond of union existing between them: in a word, it causes the narrative to advance not by development but by *accretion*. Accordingly we find it used (1) upon occasions when a writer wishes to place two facts in *co-ordination* with one another, to exhibit the second as simultaneous with the first rather than as succeeding it; for instance, in the conjunction of two synonymous or similar ideas: and (2), chiefly in the later books, when the language was allowing itself gradually to acquiesce in and adopt the mode of speech customary in the Aramaic dialects (Chaldee and Syriac), in which the rival construction with וְ, at least in historical times, was never employed.

132. Thus (1) Gen. xxxi. 7[1] החל בי והחלף. Num. xxi. 15 וְנִשְׁעָן . . . נָטָה. xxiii. 19[2] (coupling a parallel term to אָמַר under וְ). Deut. ii. 30. xxxiii. 2, 20. Josh. ix. 12

[1] This may possibly be freq.: for pf. החל, cf. § 114 *a*.

[2] But *v.* 20 ובורך, xxiv. 17 וקם are future: see §§ 119 *a*, 113. 1.

(cf. 5, where ו is omitted). Judg. v. 26 *d* (after the *perfect* מחקה: but והלמה prob. a graphic frequentative, followed by מחקה according to § 114 *Obs.*). 1 Sam. xii. 2 זקנתי ושבתי *am old and grey-headed.* 1 Kings viii. 47. xx. 27. Is. i. 2 גדלתי ורוממתי, 8. ii. 11 ושח. v. 14. viii. 8 ועבר (שטף § 14 γ). ix. 7. xix. 6 (§ 14 γ), 13 f. xxiv. 6 (cf. the *ἀσύνδετα*, *vv.* 5, 7 f.). xxix. 20. xxxiv. 14 *b*, 15. xxxvii. 25, 27 (2 Kings xix. 26 וַיֵּבֹשׁוּ). xxxviii. 12. xli. 4. xliii. 12 (as in i. 2, observe there is no change of tone). xliv. 8. lv. 10 (*might* be conv.: see vi. 11 f.), 11. Joel i. 7.

Omitting instances in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, we have several from the Psalms: xx. 9. xxii. 15. xxvi. 3. xxvii. 2. xxxiv. 11. xxxvii. 14. xxxviii. 9, 20[1]. lxvi. 14. lxxxvi. 13, 17. xcvii. 6. cxxxi. 2. cxxxv. 10, 12; perhaps also xxii. 6. xxviii. 7. xxxiv. 5, 6. xxxv. 15. lxxvi. 9. lxxx. 13? cxlviii. 5. Prov. xxii. 3: add further, Job ix. 30? xvi. 15. xviii. 11. xxix. 21 *a*. Cant. ii. 10. Lam. ii. 22. iii. 42. And after an impf. with וְ, Gen. xlix. 23. Is. ix. 19.

Obs. Sometimes, however, in cases of this sort, the second verb is annexed by means of וְ: cf. Ex. xxxi. 17. Is. lvii. 11. Ps. vii. 16. xvi. 8. xx. 9 *b*. Job x. 8, cf. xiv. 10.

133. (2) Such are the only instances which seem capable of being reduced to a definite rule. Of the instances which remain, those which occur in the later books may be fairly regarded as attributable to the influence of Aramaic usage: but for the few which are met with in the earlier books (Genesis—2 Samuel, Isaiah), it is more

[1] Here, though the tone is on the ultima, the *waw* is not necessarily conversive: in verbs ע"ע, even where no *waw conversive* is prefixed, the tone is sometimes *milra'*, as Ps. lxix. 5 רִבּוּ. See Kalisch, ii. § lxii. 1 (*b*).

than doubtful whether such an explanation is legitimate or admissible. For, independently of the question of date, it is hardly credible that had the Aramaic influence existed it should only have made itself felt eight, or even (including some cases in which the sense is more probably frequentative) fourteen times in all the historical books from Genesis to Judges: in the later portions of the Old Testament, it will be remembered, it shews itself far more frequently. Why, upon those eight (or fourteen) occasions, the construction observed uniformly elsewhere (ויאמר דוד, or the alternating ודוד אמר) was abandoned must, I think, remain an insoluble enigma: we may strive at times to conceal the anomaly by supposing that the novel construction has been chosen in order to introduce the notice of some fact lying *outside* the main course of the narrative, and consequently disconnected with what precedes, so that the ו is equivalent to *also* rather than *and;* but such a supposition is eminently unsatisfactory[1], and often untrue. The only course open, therefore, is to chronicle the cases in question as *isolated irregularities*, of which no further explanation can be offered.

Gen. xv. 6. xxi. 25. xxviii. 6. xxxviii. 5 והיה (it may be safely said that this sentence reads unlike any other in the whole of the Old Testament: LXX αὕτη points to וְהִוא—a very common mode of expression: cf. Judg. xviii. 28). Ex. v. 16. Judg. iii. 23. vii. 13. xvi. 18 (*might* be freq.: cf. vi. 3). 1 Sam. iii. 13. iv. 19 (cf. p. 152). xvii. 38 וְנָתַן (read the inf. abs. וְנָתוֹן, exactly as Gen. xli. 43 etc.: comp.

[1] It does not explain why in Gen. xxi. 25, for example, we should have והוכח אברהם instead of what would be the more usual form (§ 76 *Obs.*) ואברהם הוכח.

also Is. xxxvii. 19 with 2 Kings xix. 18), 48. xx. 16. xxv. 20. 2 Sam. vi. 16. vii. 9 *b?* 11 *a?* 11 *b* והגיד (cf. 1 Sam. iii. 13). xiii. 18 ונעל (as Judg. iii. 23: it is singular that we should find this strange use of the perfect twice with the same verb). xvi. 5. xxiii. 20. 1 Kings xi. 10. xii. 32. xiii. 3. xiv. 27. xx. 21. xxi. 12[1]. Is. xxii. 14. xxviii. 26. xxxviii. 15 ('*both*'). Ps. cxxxvi. 14, 15, 21 (·ו 11, 18).

In 2 Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Chronicles, this usage becomes somewhat more frequent, so I forbear from wearying the reader with a complete list of citations. The impf. and ·ו, however, continues still to be distinctly the predominant construction: even in Ezra, for example, the pf. with ו occurs only iii. 10. vi. 22, 30, 36 (ix. 6, 13, § 132), and in Nehemiah only xii. 39. xiii. 1, 30 (ix. 7, § 132). Similarly in Daniel (excluding of course the Chaldee portion, from ii. 4 *b*–vii. 28), ·ו is constantly employed, though in viii–xii a few instances of the perfect are met with[2]. There is only one book

---

[1] In some passages where, at first sight, the use of the perfect seems anomalous, it must be explained in a frequentative sense, § 120: this is certainly the case in Ex. xxxvi. 29 f. (notice יהיו). 1 Sam. ii. 22. xvi. 14 (observe the partcp. *v.* 15). xxvii. 9 (cf. יחיה). 2 Sam. xix. 18 f. xx. 12 (continuation of הבא, § 117); probably also in the following, Gen. xxxiv. 5. xxxvii. 3 (cf. 1 Sam. ii. 19). Ex. xxxvi. 38 (cf. 1 Kings vi. 32, 35, and p. 164). xxxviii. 28. xxxix. 3? Num. xxi. 20 ונשקפה (pf. §§ 101, 103: *used to look*, cf. § 120 *Obs.*). 1 Sam. v. 7. xxiv. 11. 2 Sam. xvi. 13. Is. xl. 6. Ps. lxxx. 13 (cf. 14). But Ex. xxxvi. 1 may well belong to the speech of Moses xxxv. 30 ff., in which case ועשה will be a future. On 1 Sam. xvii. 34 f., cf. above, p. 134.

[2] Viz., viii. 7. x. 7. xii. 5 (but cf. viii. 2, 3. x. 5, 8); x. 1? 14. In viii. 4 *b* we have evidently two frequentatives, cf. יעמדו; *v.* 12 the perfects follow תשלך (§ 113. 2, 3); and *vv.* 11, 27. ix. 5 (cf. 1 Kings viii. 47). x. 15 are to be explained by § 132.

in the Old Testament, Qohéleth or Ecclesiastes, in which this state of things is reversed, and the perfect with simple *waw* obtains a marked and indeed almost exclusive preponderance. In the whole of Qohéleth ·וְ occurs not more than *three* times, i. 17. iv. 1, 7, whereas the other construction is of constant occurrence. This circumstance, taken in connection with what is *uniformly* observable in all other parts of the Old Testament, is by itself, quite independently of any other considerations, sufficient to stamp the book as being in all probability the latest in the whole canon. In the Song of Songs ·וְ occurs but twice, vi. 1: in this book, however, there is very little occasion for *either* form being used, and in fact the perfect with *waw* occurs only twice likewise (ii. 3, 10: but its use in *v.* 10, § 132, is no criterion of date, being common to all periods of the language).

134. Exactly as the perfect with weak *waw* is in Hebrew superseded, and in fact almost banished from the language, by the imperfect with strong *waw*, so the impf. with weak *waw*, although not quite to the same extent, is yet in the great majority of cases superseded by the pf. with strong *waw*. Allusion has been already made (§ 116) to the rarity with which two imperfects are found united by וְ, after conjunctions like פֶּן or אִם: although it is not so uncommon to find them coupled in this way when they bear a frequentative, future, or jussive sense, yet the other construction is still decidedly preferred, and the occurrence of *two* imperfects must even then, comparatively speaking, be termed exceptional. In general the imperfect is only repeated when it is desired to lay some particular stress on the verb, or, as before, in order to combine synonyms: the repetition is also more

frequent in the poetical than in the historical books. Examples in a future or jussive sense:—Gen. i. 9, 26. ix. 27. xvii. 2. xxii. 17. xxvii. 29, 31. Ex. xxiv. 7. xxvi. 24. Num. xiv. 12. xxi. 27. Deut. xvii. 13 (=xix. 20. xxi. 21). xxx. 12 f. Josh. vii. 3, cf. 9. Judg. vii. 3. xiii. 8 al.; Is. xli. 15. xlii. 14, 21, 23. xliv. 7. xlv. 24, 25. xlvi. 4, 5. xlvii. 11. xlix. 8 etc. As a frequentative, however, this repetition of an imperfect is considerably rarer:—Ex. xxiii. 8 (=Deut. xvi. 19). Is. xl. 30. xliv. 16 f. xlvi. 6 f. lix. 7. Ps. xxv. 9? xxxvii. 40. xlix. 9. lix. 5, 7. lxxiii. 8. lxxxiii. 4. xcvii. 3. cxlv. 19.

For another case in which two or more imperfects are united by means of וְ, see above, § 84.

CHAPTER X.

Hypotheticals.

135. We arrive at the last part of our subject—the forms assumed in Hebrew by *hypothetical* or conditional sentences. These, it will appear, involve nothing more than an extension of the same principles and methods which we have already seen regulate in general the construction of sentences and their interdependence upon one another: after the full explanations, therefore, which have been given of the nature and significance of the two tenses, both with and without וְ, it will be sufficient in most cases simply to enunciate the different types of hypothetical propositions, without any further elucidation than such as is afforded by illustrative examples.

136. I. *If I see him* (the time at which this is imagined as possibly taking place not being further indicated, but being understood to belong to either the more immediate or the remoter future), *I will let him know.*

With an *imperfect* in the protasis. The apodosis may then begin—

(*a*) With וְ *conv.* and the perfect; so very frequently:—Gen. xviii. 26 *if I shall find* (or simply *if I find*) fifty righteous in Sodom וְנָשָׂאתִי *I will pardon* the whole place for their sakes. xxiv. 8. xxxii. 9, 18 f. Ex. xix. 5. xxiii.

22 if thou hearkenest, וְאִיבַּתִּי. Lev. xxv. 25. xxvi. 3 f. 2 Sam. xix. 8. Ps. lxxxix. 31–33 וּפָקַדְתִּי . . . אִם יַעַזְבוּ. Job viii. 18 etc.

Obs. The verb is sometimes separated from the ו, and so lapses into the imperfect:—Ex. viii. 22. Num. xix. 12. xxx. 9. Josh. xx. 5. 2 Chron. vii. 13 f. Prov. xix. 19. Job xiv. 7.

(β) With the impf. (without וְ); this likewise is very frequent and not distinguishable in meaning from *a*:—Gen. iv. 12 when thou tillest the ground לֹא תֹסִף *it will* no more etc. xlii. 37 my two sons תָּמִית thou mayest kill אִם לֹא אֲבִיאֲנוּ if I do not bring him back to thee. 1 Sam. xii. 25. Obadiah 5, cf. Jer. xlix. 9 *a* (*b*, pf. as γ). Ps. lxxv. 3. cxxxii. 12. cxxxviii. 7. Prov. iv. 16 unless they do evil לֹא יִשְׁנוּ they *do not* (freq., or *cannot*) sleep.

(β*) The simple imperfect may of course be replaced if necessary by a voluntative or imperative:—1 Sam. xx. 21. xxi. 10 (cf. Is. xxi. 12). 2 Kings ii. 10. Ps. xlix. 17. lxii. 11. Job xix. 28 f. xxxvi. 22 etc.

With וְ prefixed, very rare:—Gen. xiii. 9. 2 Sam. xii. 8.

(γ) With perfect alone[1] (expressing the certainty and

---

[1] With this use of the perfect compare in Greek Plat. Krat. 432 A *ὥσπερ καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ δέκα ἤ ὅστις βούλει ἄλλος ἀριθμός, ἐὰν ἀφέλῃς τι ἢ προσθῇς, ἕτερος εὐθὺς γέγονε.* Soph. Phil. 1280 *εἰ δὲ μή τι πρὸς καιρὸν λέγων Κυρῷ πέπαυμαι.* The *aorist* is also similarly met with, as Phileb. 17 D *ὅταν γὰρ ταῦτα λάβῃς οὕτω, τότε ἐγένου σοφός.* Gorg. 484 etc., on which the strikingly apposite remarks of Riddell, *Apology of Plato*, p. 154, are worth quoting: 'The subjunctive construction with *ἄν*, not admissible with a past Tense, constrains us to see in the Aorist the expression of an action *instantaneously complete, rather than necessarily past.*' Compare Winer, § 40. 4 *b*, also 5 *b*, who quotes Livy xxi. 43 si eundem animum habuerimus, *vicimus.*

In English, the *present* is sometimes used with the same object:

suddenness with which the result immediately accompanies the occurrence of the protasis):—Num. xxxii. 23 if you do not do so הִנֵּה חֲטָאתֶם see you have sinned! 1 Sam. ii. 16 and if not, לָקַחְתִּי *I take* it by force! cf. Is. xxvi. 9 *b*. Ezek. xxxiii. 6 נִלְכָּד. Hos. xii. 12 (היו in apod., 'of the certain future'). Job xx. 12–14. Cf. after the indefinite אֲשֶׁר Gen. xxiv. 14 הֹכַחְתָּ.

Obs. Compare the manner in which the perfect is found, not indeed in a formal apodosis, but still with a reference to some preceding conditional clause—implicitly if not explicitly stated. Lev. xiii. 25 פרחה. xvii. 3 f. the apodosis proper ends at ההוא: then follow the words דם שפך i. e. *he has* (in the case assumed) *shed* blood. xx. 11. Num. xix. 13 טמא, 20 for (under the circumstances assigned) he has defiled the sanctuary. xv. 25 והם הביאו (when the directions 24 have been observed, they *will have* brought their offering). Ezek. xxxiii. 5. Prov. vi. 3 באת. xvi. 26 *b*. xxi. 7. Job xv. 25, 27.

(δ) With participle:—Gen. iv. 7. Lev. xxi. 9.

Without any verb in apod.:—Gen. iv. 24 ו. xxxi. 50. Ps. viii. 4. cxx. 7. Qoh. iv. 10 *b* ו. x. 11 ו.

Slightly different are 1 Sam. vi. 10 if it goeth up by B. הוא עשה HE *hath done* us this great evil. 1 Kings xxii. 28 if thou returnest לא דבר יי בי Yahweh *hath not spoken* by me. Num. xvi. 29. Ezek. xiv. 9 *a*.

Obs. Occasionally the imperfect is thus found in the protasis in reference to *past* time:—Gen. xxxi. 8 אִם יֹאמַר *if ever* he said . . . , וַיֵּלְדוּ then all the flock *would* bear etc. Ex. xl. 37 (apod. וְלֹא יִסָּעוּ); cf. Num. ix. 19–21, and the impff. in Job xxxi, alternating with pff. These differ from Gen. xxxviii. 9. Num. xxi. 9. Judg. ii. 18. Amos vii. 2. Ps. lxxviii. 34, and perhaps xli. 7, where the *perfect* is used: 'and it came to pass, *if* or *when* the serpents *had* bitten a man that

---

Shakespeare, *Ant. and Cl.* ii. 5. 26 If thou say so, villain, thou *kill'st* thy mistress. Milton, *P. L.* v. 613.

he looked, and lived,'—the idea of repetition is dropped from the protasis, and retained only in the pff. with ו, which introduce the apodosis. Lam. iii. 8 גם כי אצעק שתם even when I *would fain* cry, *he stopped* my prayer.

137. Sometimes the participle is found in the protasis—accompanied or not by יש or אין; this may then be followed by—

(α) The perfect and וְ:—Gen. xxiv. 42 f. Lev. iii. 7. Num. xxxv. 10 f. Judg. vi. 36 f. (where וידעתי=may I know, cf. 39 יהי־נא, and § 119 δ). xi. 9 אם משיבים אתם if you are *going to* bring me back.

(β) The imperfect:—Lev. iii. 1. Num. xxxiv. 2 when ye *are entered in*. Deut. xviii. 9. 2 Kings vii. 2, 19 (after הנה: cf. Jer. iii. 1. Ezek. xvii. 10, 12–15, where הֲ likewise follows in the apodosis).

(β*) Gen. xxiv. 49. Judg. ix. 15. Jer. xlii. 13 (apod. 15 ועתה).

(γ) Perfect alone:—Judg. xv. 3 (where, however, כי is perhaps=*for*), cf. Job xxxiii. 23–25.

(δ) Another participle:—Ex. viii. 17 (cf. ix. 17 f. § 126). ix. 2 f. 1 Sam. xix. 11. Jer. xxvi. 15.

138. II. *If I have seen him* (i. till any time in the indefinite or more or less remote future: ii. during a period extending up to the moment of speaking, or to a moment otherwise fixed by the context), *I will let him know*. In the first of these cases the sense conveyed by the perfect is hardly distinguishable from that borne by the imperfect in the instances just explained: the pf. is not, however, so frequent as the impf., and inasmuch as it describes an event as *done* rather than as *about to be done*, its adoption represents the actual occurrence of the case assumed as somewhat more probable than

it would be if the impf. had been used (*si videro* rather than *si videbo*). Observe that in i. the principal verb is succeeded in the protasis by perfects with *waw conv.* (Gen. xliii. 9. Job xi. 13 f.), while in ii. it is succeeded by the imperfect and וְ.

i. (*a*) With the pf. and *waw conv.* in the apodosis:—as Gen. xliii. 9 אִם לֹא הֲבִיאֹתִיו . . . וְחָטָאתִי si non *reduxero*, per omnem vitam reus *ero* (cf. xlii. 37). xlvii. 6. 2 Sam. xv. 33 LXX ἐὰν μὲν διαβῇς μετ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ ἔσῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ εἰς βάσταγμα (where καὶ is really superfluous). 2 Kings vii. 4 אִם אָמַרְנוּ נָבוֹא הָעִיר וְהָרָעָב בָּעִיר וָמַתְנוּ שָׁם Vulg. sive ingredi *voluerimus* civitatem, fame *moriemur:* sive *manserimus* hic, moriendum nobis est. Mic. v. 7 *b*. Job vii. 4 if (at any time) I lie down, וְאָמַרְתִּי[1] *I say*, When shall I get up? (waiting wearily for the morning), 13 f. when I say etc., וְחִתַּתַּנִי *then thou terrifiest me*. x. 14 if I sin, thou watchest me. xxi. 6. Lam. iii. 32.

(*β*) With the impf. alone in the apodosis:—Deut. xxxii. 41 אִם שָׁנּוֹתִי if (at any time) *I have whet* (or simply *I whet*) my glittering sword וְתֹאחֵז so that[2] my hand takes hold on judgment, אָשִׁיב *I will requite* vengeance etc. Is. iv. 3 f. xxviii. 15 Kt. Vulg. cum *transierit*, non veniet super nos. Ps. xxi. 12? xli. 7. lviii. 11 כִּי חָזָה when he *hath seen* (or seeth) vengeance. lxiii. 7. xciv. 18 if (at any time) אָמַרְתִּי *I say*, My foot hath slipped, thy mercy *will hold* (or *holdeth*, freq.) me up. Prov. ix. 12 *b* (אם understood from

[1] Tone as Ps. xxviii. 1, § 104.

[2] וחאחז must be explained by §§ 61, 62: it is impossible to suppose that it is merely parallel to שנותי, on account of the unique sequence of tenses which such a supposition would involve: a perfect after a word like אם followed by an impf. with ו would, so far as I know, be without precedent.

a, exactly as in Job x. 15 *b* from 15 *a*; cf. xvi. 6. xxii. 23). Job ix. 30 f. (וְהִזַּכּוֹתִי, § 104; unless the passage belongs rather to §§ 144, 132).

(β*) Prov. xxiii. 22 *b*. xxv. 21. Job xi. 13 f.

(γ) With perfect al one: Is. xl. 7. Jer. xlix. 9 *b*.

And without any verb in the apodosis:—Jer. xiv. 18. Ps. ciii. 16? Prov. xxiv. 14. Job xvii. 13–15, all with וְ.

ii. As already stated, this class of instances differs from those cited under i. in the nature of the *protasis*: a few examples will make it plain in what the difference consists. The apodosis may commence—

(*a*) With the perfect and וְ:—Num. v. 27 if she *have* defiled herself וַתִּמְעֹל *and been faithless*, וּבָאוּ *then shall* they come etc. xv. 24 if it *have been* done (the other case follows *v*. 27 in the imperfect), ועשו etc. xxxv. 22–24 וְאִם . . . הִדְפוֹ and if (in the assumed case) *he have hit* him unexpectedly וַיָּמֹת *and he have died*, וְשָׁפְטוּ the congregation shall judge.

(β) With the imperfect:—Num. xxx. 6. Jer. xxxiii. 25 f. if I have not made a covenant with the day (as I have done) אֶמְאָס I will reject. Ezek. xxxiii. 9, cf. 8.

(β*) Gen. xlvii. 16. Judg. ix. 16–19 if ye *have* done honestly (foll. by וְ), rejoice in Abimélekh! 1 Sam. xxvi. 19. Ps. vii. 4 f. Job xxxi. 39 f. Esth. viii. 5.

(γ) With the perfect alone:—Ezek. iii. 19 הִצַּלְתָּ.

Obs. The perfect with אם or או is thus met with in *subordinate* hypothetical clauses: so Ex. xxi. 36 או נודע but *if it be known* (a case supposed to have occurred under the conditions stated 35 *a*). xxii. 2 if the sun *have risen* (the impf. however *may* be used, *v*. 6 'when a man gives etc. if the thief be found'—this would be continued if requisite by a pf. with וְ *conv.*), 7. Lev. iv. 23 si confessus fuerit, 28. v. 1 או ראה או ידע, 3–5 or when it touches etc. and it

be hidden from him, *but he have* (afterwards) *ascertained it* and be guilty, or when etc. (4 propounding a similar possibility) והיה *then it shall be* etc. 17, 21–23 או מצא. xiii. 2 f. when there is . . . and the priest sees it . . . and the hair הפך *have turned* white: so repeatedly in this chapter after הנה. Num. v. 14. xxxv. 16–18, 20 f. if יהדפנו he hit him in hatred—או השליך whether he *have thrown* something at him insidiously, או הכהו or *have smitten* him with his hand (two alternatives possible under the assumed case of hatred) וימת *and he die*, מות יומת he shall be surely put to death.

139. III. *If I had seen him, I would have told him* (*εἰ εἶδον ἀνήγγειλα ἄν*· the protasis is supposed not to have been realised, and consequently the apodosis does not take place). For this case Hebrew uses the *perfect* in both clauses, whether after אִם Ps. lxxiii. 15; or אִלּוּ Esth. vii. 4; or לוּ Judg. viii. 19 if you had kept them alive (which you did not do) לא הרגתי I should not have killed you *οὐκ ἂν ἀπέκτεινα ὑμᾶς* (as I am just going to do: not *I should not kill you* *οὐκ ἂν ἀπέκτεινον*, which would be אהרג, because Gid'on has in his mind the time when the action will have been completed). xiii. 23; or לוּלֵא Judg. xiv. 18. 1 Sam. xxv. 34 if thou hadst not hastened וַתָּבֹאתִי and come, there had surely (חי יי after the oath כי אם) not been left to Nabal etc. (as now there will be left). Is. i. 9. Ps. xciv. 17. cvi. 23 (apod. put first, as אמרתי Deut. xxxii. 26, but being connected with what precedes it appears in the form וַיֹּאמֶר, otherwise it would be אָמַר as in Deut.). cxix. 92. cxxiv. 2 f.

140. Where no apodosis follows, the perfect with לוּ may denote a *wish*—one, however, which has not been realised.

Num. xiv. 2 לוּ מַתְנוּ. xx. 3. Josh. vii. 7. Is. xlviii. 18 f. לוּ הִקְשַׁבְתָּ O that thou hadst hearkened to me וַיְהִי *and that* thy peace had been like a river! etc. (the לוּ as Josh. vii. 7,

1 Sam. xxv. 34: by this means it becomes no longer necessary to understand לוּ here as introducing the apodosis, § 127 γ). lxiii. 19. Ps. xxvii. 13.

141. Again, instead of going on regularly to the apodosis, the sentence sometimes breaks off with an aposiopesis, and the result which would have occurred if the protasis had been realised is introduced more emphatically by כִּי עַתָּה or כִּי אָז *for then, in that case.* Thus Gen. xxxi. 42 if the God of my father had not been with me—כִּי עַתָּה שִׁלַּחְתָּנִי—*for then* (or, if we prefer uniting this second clause to the first, and so making it into a real and formal apodosis, *indeed then*) thou *hadst* (or *wouldst have*) sent me away empty! xliii. 10. Num. xxii. 33 (if for אוּלַי we read לוּלֵי). 1 Sam. xiv. 30 (omit לא with LXX). 2 Sam. ii. 27.

It is evidently only one step further than this for the clause with כי עתה to be found by itself, the actual protasis being suppressed altogether, and only a *virtual* one being pointed to by עתה:—Ex. ix. 15 for *then* (or *else* i. e. if the intention expressed in 14 *b*, and further expanded in 16, had not existed) שלחתי את ידי ואך *I should have* put forth my hand and smitten thee etc. (i. e. instantaneously instead of slowly: for the idea, cf. Ps. lix. 12). 1 Sam. xiii. 13 thou hast not kept the commandment of Yahweh; *for then* (if thou hadst done so) הֵכִין he would have established thy kingdom. 2 Kings xiii. 19 אז. Job iii. 13 *a* (xvi. 7 is different: עתה there resembles עתה in 1 Sam. xiv. 30 if we adhere to the Masoretic text, *as the case actually is*). xxxi. 28 כי alone.

142. If under these circumstances the *imperfect* occurs in the protasis, it naturally denotes a condition realisable in the present or the future: where no apodosis follows,

we shall then have, in accordance with the context, and the tone in which the words are uttered, the expression of either hope or alarm—either a *wish* or a *fear*[1]—thus Gen. xvii. 18 לוּ יִחְיֶה *if* Ishma'el might live before thee! (cf. the imperative xxiii. 18, the jussive xxx. 34). Ex. xxxii. 32 אִם תִּשָּׂא if thou wouldst only forgive their sin! Ps. lxxxi. 9. xcv. 6 *b* (in both cases the following verses contain the words to be listened to). Prov. ii. 1. xxiv. 11.

On the other hand we hear the language of alarm:—Gen. l. 15 לוּ יִשְׂטְמֵנוּ if he were to hate us! Ex. iv. 1 וְהֵן and if they do not believe me!

As before, the protasis may be succeeded by כִּי עַתָּה:—Job vi. 2 f. לוּ O that my vexation might be *weighed* . . . כִּי עַתָּה יִכָּבֵד *for then* it *would be* heavier than the sand. viii. 5 f. 2 Kings v. 3 אַז.

Or the clause with כִּי עַתָּה may occur without any actual protasis:—Job iii. 13 *b*. xiii. 19 *for then* (if there were any one able to contend with me and prove me in the wrong) I *would* be silent and die: cf. xxiii. 7. xxxii. 22 (after כִּמְעַט) quickly (if I flattered) would my Maker take me away.

143. IV. In some of the instances last cited we may notice that the protasis states a case which might indeed conceivably occur (as Gen. l. 15), but which may also (as Job vi. 2) be purely imaginary. We are thus conducted to another class of conditional propositions, consisting of an *imperfect*[2] *in both clauses*, and corresponding

[1] Compare Ps. xli. 9 LXX *μὴ ὁ κοιμώμενος οὐχὶ προσθήσει τοῦ ἀναστῆναι*; where the affirmative answer, always expected when *μὴ οὐ* is employed, is contemplated not with *hope*, but with *alarm*: 'Won't he that is now sick—won't he recover?'

[2] It will be remembered that two imperfects have met us before,

to the double optative in Greek, *If I were to see him* (on the mere supposition, be it ever so unlikely or hyperbolical, that I were to see him) *I would tell him.*

Where the ideas contained in the protasis and apodosis respectively are parallel and similar we must render the conditional particle by *if:* where they are contrasted we may, if we please, employ *though.*

With אם :—Gen. xiii. 16 so that אִם־יוּכַל *if* a man *could* number the stars, thy seed also יִמָּנֶה *might be numbered.* Num. xxii. 18 (cf. 1 Kings xiii. 8). Is. i. 18 *though* they were as scarlet, they should become white as snow. x. 22. Amos ix. 2–4 (notice the apod. continued by וְ and pf. 3, 'from there would I search וּלְקַחְתִּים and take them:' so *v.* 4). Obadiah 4 (Jer. xlix. 16 כִּי). Ps. xxvii. 3. l. 12. cxxx. 3. cxxxix. 8 (also cohort.). Job ix. 3, 20. xvi. 6 (cohortative). xx. 6 f. xxxiv. 14 f. Cant. viii. 7. Qoh. vi. 3 though a man יוליד *were to* beget a hundred . . . and even (after all this) though the grave לא היתה *had not come* to him, I say, an untimely birth (would be) better than he.

---

in the formula *If I see him I will tell him,* ἐὰν ἴδω ἀναγγελῶ, and it may appear strange that two significations should be assigned to the same combination. But the fact is that in *both* cases, in ἐὰν ἴδω as well as in εἰ ἴδοιμι, it is a mere possibility that is enunciated: now, when from the circumstances of the case the chances of this possible event taking place are but small, we mark in English our sense of the increased improbability by throwing the verbs into a form more expressive of contingency. In employing the optative in place of the subjunctive mood, the Greeks did precisely the same: the Hebrew language, on the other hand, was content and able to acquiesce in a single mode of expression. Nor is the ambiguity any greater than that which exists in a parallel case in our own language, where *if I had anything, I would give it,* has often to do duty for both εἰ εἶχον, ἐδίδουν ἄν and εἰ ἔχοιμι, διδοίην ἄν.

Neh. i. 9. Jer. ii. 22 though thou wert to wash with potash, thy iniquity נִכְתָּם (would remain) in a state of blackness before me: the partcp. also Ps. xxvii. 3 *b*.

With כִּי:—Is. xliii. 2[1]. Jer. li. 53. Hab. i. 5. Zech. viii. 6 (if it should, it would . . . : as Gen. xiii. 16). Ps. xxxvii. 24 *a*. xlix. 19 f. (apod. תבוא): with גַּם כִּי Ps. xxiii. 4. Is. i. 15 (with partcp. in apod.: *though* ye multiply, I will not hear. The partcp. is found likewise Jer. xiv. 12): with גַּם אִם Qoh. viii. 17, and לוּ Job xvi. 4 I too like you אדברה *would gladly* speak: if your soul were in my soul's stead, אחבירה *I would* heap up words against you ואניעה and *would* shake my head at you.

The above are the most common types of hypothetical constructions in Hebrew: **V** and **VI** are, accidentally, of much rarer occurrence.

144. V. *If I had seen him, I would* (now) *tell him.*

Deut. xxxii. 29 לוּ חָכְמוּ if they *had been* wise יַשְׂכִּילוּ they would understand this (at the present time—which they do not do). 2 Sam. xviii. 13. 2 Kings v. 13. Jer. xxiii. 22 if they had[2] stood in my council וְיַשְׁמִיעוּ then they would be making my words heard (which they are not doing). Ps. xliv. 21 f. if we *had* forgotten the name of our God וַנִּפְרֹשׂ and stretched out our hands to a strange god, *would* not God find this out? (he does *not* find it out, because it has not been done: on the contrary, *upon thy account* etc. *v.* 23). lxvi. 18. Job ix. 15, 16. Qoh. vi. 6 אִלּוּ (partcp. in apod.)

Conversely Deut. xxxii. 26 I *had* (should have) said

---

[1] Is. liv. 10 כי is rather *for:* cf. li. 6. xlix. 15 (yea, these *may* forget, but I will not forget).

[2] Or, 'if they stand, *then let them,*' etc.: this would agree better with וַיֵּשְׁבוּם.

I would scatter them, אִם לֹא אָגוּר did I not dread the vexation of the enemy (the vexation his triumph would cause me).

145. VI. *If I saw him* (*now*, which I do not do) *I would tell him* (εἰ ἑώρων, ἀνήγγελλον ἄν): with לוּ and a participle in the protasis.

2 Sam. xviii. 12. 2 Kings iii. 14 לוּלֵי אֲנִי נֹשֵׂא except I *were favourable* to Yehoshaphat, אִם אַבִּיט I would surely not look at thee! Ps. lxxxi. 14–17 לוּ if my people שֹׁמֵעַ were hearkening to me . . ., quickly אַכְנִיעַ *would I bow* down their enemies etc. (the verses do not relate to what might have happened in the past, but to the possibilities of restoration and prosperity in the *present*). Mic. ii. 11 (תֵּהוּ apod.); cf. Job xvi. 4.

146. Hebrew, however, is capable of expressing hypothetical propositions without the aid of any hypothetical particle to introduce them[1]. There are three principal

[1] The reader will be tempted to compare this omission of the conditional particle in Hebrew with the omission which not unfrequently takes place in English and German. There is, however, a material difference between the two cases. In English and German the omission is always accompanied by an *inversion* of the usual order of words, which, by placing the verb before the subject, suggests to the reader the idea of a question, and so apprises him that the proposition involved is only an *assumption*, and not a fact. But in Hebrew the reader has no such assistance: his own appreciation of the general drift of a passage can alone teach him the exact sense in which the writer intended his words to be understood. This, however, is by no means a singular phenomenon: how often, for example, are we left without any visible indication whether a sentence is to be taken *interrogatively* or not! In fact, the ancients had often to trust to their own acuteness and general quickness of apprehension in cases where the modern reader finds himself guided by some external artifice which precludes the slightest possibility of mistake.

forms which such *imperfect hypotheticals* may assume: these may be roughly characterised as the double perfect with וְ *conv.*, the double jussive, and the hypothetical imperative. In addition to these there are a few isolated forms which resemble the types already discussed, the only difference being that the conditional particle is not present.

147. (i) The double perfect with וְ *conv.*

This use of the perfect with וְ is nothing more than an extension, in a particular case, of its employment as a frequentative: sometimes, indeed, it is hardly so much as that; for often the contingent nature of the events spoken of will be sufficiently clear in a translation from the sense of the passage without the addition of any hypothetical particle[1]. A single perfect with וְ indicates, as we know, an action the actual date of which is indeterminate, but which is capable of being realised at any or every moment: *two* perfects with וְ will indicate therefore *two* actions, which may similarly be realised at any or every moment. Now put the two verbs by each other in a single sentence, and the juxtaposition at once causes them *mutually to determine one another:* the reader feels that the idea intended to be conveyed is just this, that the occurrence of one of the events was always, so to speak, the signal for the occurrence of the other. And thus we see how a *compound frequentative* may become identical with a *simple hypothetical.*

148. (1) In past or present time:—

Ex. xxxiii. 10 וְקָם . . . וְרָאוּ *and* all the people *used to see*

---

[1] Hence, some of the passages quoted here will likewise be found cited above, § 113. 4.

and stand up (or, *would* see and stand up): but the moments of standing up are obviously fixed and determined by the moments of seeing, which are plainly conceived as preceding them: this relation between the two acts may be more explicitly stated in English thus—'*if, when, whenever* the people saw, they stood (or, used to stand) up.' And it is particularly to be observed that our language prefers the undisguised conditional construction when the first verb (or that in the protasis) is *subordinate* in importance to the second, when e. g. it is such a word as ראה or שמע, although in Hebrew the two are strictly co-ordinate—an additional instance to the many we have already had of the way in which we bring into relief what the older language left as a plain surface.

Ex. xvi. 21 LXX rightly ἡνίκα δὲ διεθέρμαινεν ὁ ἥλιος, ἐτήκετο. xxxiv. 35. Num. x. 17 f. 21 f. (the writer passes *v.* 17 from the description of a *particular* case, with which he began 11–16, to that of the *general* custom: hence the striking series of perfects with וְ 17–27). 1 Sam. xvii. 34 f. 1 Kings xviii. 10 (if we desert the accents: but the sense will be practically the same if we adhere to them and translate by two separate frequentatives). Jer. xviii. 4, 8 וְשָׁב וְנִחַמְתִּי and *if* it turns, *then I repent*, 10. xx. 9 (another of the few passages in which the change of tone is noticeable) וְאָמַרְתִּי *if I say* (or *said*), I will not make mention of him, וְהָיָה then *it is* (or *was*) in my heart like a burning fire (where Auth. Vers. singularly fails to reproduce the sensation of Jeremiah's *prolonged* agitation, so clearly indicated by the language of the original). Ezek. xviii. 10 and *if* he begets a son . . . (*v.* 13) וָחָי *shall he live?*

With the second verb separated from וְ, and conse-

quently in the impf.:—Num. xxiii. 20 וברך ולא אשיבנו and *if* he blesses, I cannot reverse it.

149. (2) In the future:—

(α) Where the sense is plain without the insertion of *if*:—

Gen. ix. 16. xxxiii. 13 and they will overdrive them one day, and all the flock will die (every one feels that this is a contingent, not a certain result that is anticipated). xlii. 38. xliv. 29. Ex. xxxiii. 23. Num. x. 3, 5 f. 1 Kings xvii. 12 *b*.

(β) Where the *contingency* attaching to the double event is hardly clear without the addition of *if* or *when*:—

Gen. xliv. 22 וְעָזַב *and if* he leaves his father: וָמֵת he will die. Ex. iii. 18 ושמעו and *if* they listen to thy voice (iv. 1 seems to shew that the words here are not the announcement of a future *fact*). iv. 14*[1] וראך ושמח and

[1] In all the passages marked thus *, the first verb is ראה, which, as is not unfrequently the case in Hebrew, though against the idiom of our own language, is treated as though it represented an independent, substantive idea, equal in importance to that expressed by the succeeding verb. Thus Gen. xlv. 27 'and he saw the wagons, and his spirit revived;' where *saw* expresses such a subordinate and transitory idea that in English we feel disposed to render 'and *when* he saw;' this, however, would strictly have been ויהי כראותו. If we make use of a more emphatic word, we can retain the Hebrew form of sentence without its sounding unnatural, thus:—'and he *looked at* the wagons and his spirit revived.' So xlvi. 29. 1 Sam. x. 14. xvii. 51 *b*. Ezek. xx. 28. The case is similar with verbs of *hearing*, Josh. ii. 11. xxii. 12; or *finishing*, Gen. xlvii. 15, 18. Ex. xxxiv. 33. Josh. xix. 49. 2 Sam. xi. 27. Passages such as Ex. xxxix. 32. Lev. xvi. 20. Num. iv. 15. Ezek. iv. 6. v. 13, with those just quoted, explain ויכל Gen. ii. 2: the act of *completion* is regarded as sufficiently distinct and independent to have a special day assigned to it.

when he sees thee, he will rejoice. xii. 13*, 23*. xiv. 3 f. and *if* Phar'oh says. xxiii. 25 ועבדתם את יהוה ובריך. Lev. xxii. 7 (cf. Ex. xvi. 21 in the past). Num. xiv. 15 וְהֲמַתָּה and *if* thou killest. xv. 39*. Deut. iv. 29 *a* (cf. Jer. xxix. 12 f.). Judg. vii. 18. 1 Kings viii. 30 : וְשָׁמַעְתָּ וְסָלַחְתָּ and *when* thou hearest forgive (for the *repetition* of the verb שמע after what precedes cf. Lev. xiii. 3. 1 Sam. xxix. 10). Is. vi. 13 and *if* there be still in it a tenth part etc. Ezek. iv. 6. v, 13 וכלה *and when* my anger is finished. xxxiii. 3* (cf. Is. xxi. 7). Prov. iii. 24 וְשָׁכַבְתָּ (not under the government of אם); cf. Job v. 24 *b*. Jer. vii. 27.

With impf. alone in apod.:—Mal. i. 13. Neh. i. 9; also Prov. vi. 22, and possibly ix. 12, in which case cf. § 104.

Compare further Judg. vi. 13 וְיֵשׁ *and is* Yahweh with us וְלָמָּה *why then* has all this come upon us? 2 Sam. xiii. 26 וְלֹא *and not* (=and if not), let Amnon go with us. 2 Kings v. 17. x. 15 וְיֵשׁ and if it is so.

150. (ii and iii) The hypothetical imperative and double jussive.

The use of the imperative or jussive to indicate hypothetical propositions is to be explained upon exactly the same principle as that of the double perfect, although the use of a different verbal form modifies to a certain extent the nature of the condition expressed. In the present case the first verb enunciates a command or permission: the general sense of the passage, however, or the tone in which the words are uttered may indicate that the speaker does not intend the language to be understood *literally*, or to be carried into actual execution under *all and any circumstances*, but only in so far as is requisite to procure the means of realising or exhibiting the manner in which the action denoted by the second verb is involved

in, and results from, that denoted by the first. This may, of course, be done *mentally:* and thus a concise and emphatic mode of expressing a hypothetical sentence is obtained[1].

151. English as well as classical idiom (Aesch. P. V. 728 (709); Verg. Ecl. iii. 104) requires the future[2] in place of the second imperative or jussive: and it is at first sight difficult to discover a justification or satisfactory explanation of the Hebrew construction. The most plausible supposition seems to be this, that the two correlative clauses were originally pronounced in such a manner as to shew that the intention of the speaker was to mark his opinion that the two were equivalent, that you might as well assume the one as the other, that if you imagined the first realised you must conceive the second realised as well, and that thus after continual juxtaposition with this object had generated a *fixed formula* it came to be employed as the tersest and most elegant means of indicating a hypothetical case, though without a distinct remembrance of the somewhat indirect process by which it acquired the power of doing so. Thus Ps. cxlvii. 18 יִזְלוּ . . . יִשַּׁב strictly '*let him blow* with his wind! *let* the waters *flow!*' i. e. assume the one, and you must assume the other: but by long usage the stiffness which originally attached to the formula disappeared, and the *collocation* of the two verbs ceased to do more than suggest simply the idea of a hypothetical relation:

---

[1] Cf. Winer, § 43. 2 'when two imperatives are connected by *καί*, the first sometimes contains the condition (supposition) upon which the action indicated by the second will take place.'

[2] Or, at any rate, the indicative mood: cf., for example, Pope, *Essay on Man*, i. 251 f. 253–256. iv. 89–92.

in the present case, '*if* or *when* he blows with his wind, the waters flow[1].'

It will be objected that, inasmuch as the second verb in the example is the simple imperfect[2], if it were understood and treated accordingly, the meaning would be identical and the need for a circuitous explanation such as the one proposed at once superseded. To this it must be replied that such a course would leave unexplained the similar cases where the second verb is clearly shewn to be a jussive by its form (Ps. civ. 20. Prov. iii. 8 etc.): the existence of these instances, supported as they are by the parallel construction of the imperative, as well as by the analogy of the corresponding idiom in Arabic, authorises us in the inference that the verb is still jussive, although no visible indication of the fact may exist.

Obs. In Arabic the jussive is the mood which appears regularly after an imperative (whether the latter is intended to be understood in a hypothetical or a literal sense) for the purpose of indicating the *consequence* that will supervene, if the injunction conveyed by the

---

[1] We can understand without much difficulty the use of the jussive when the verb is in the third person: but so arduous is it to pass outside the magic circle prescribed by the language with which we are most familiar, that the inability of English to express the *idea* of a jussive in the first and second persons (except through the medium of a circumlocution by which its presence is disguised) constitutes a formidable obstacle in the way of our realising its application under the last-named circumstances.

[2] A double impf. in a frequentative sense would be as intelligible as the double pf., §§ 147, 148, and ought, perhaps, to be adopted for such cases as Prov. xxvi. 26 al., where the jussive form, although it exists, has not been employed, and for Ps. civ. 28–30. cix. 25, where the verbs have the old termination ן־ annexed to them, which (cf. p. 84) usage seems to have treated as incompatible with the signification of a jussive. Cf. also Ps. xci. 7.

imperative takes effect. A compound formula thus arises, of which קַח . . . יְהִי Ex. vii. 9 may be taken as the type. Inasmuch now as it is never the office of the jussive in Arabic to express a purpose or result (for which other idioms are employed) except when thus preceded by an imperative, it is natural to suppose that its appearance in such a capacity is in some way connected with the presence of this mood. A consequence which only results from the execution of a command is not like the absolute consequence of a certified fact; it is essentially limited by, dependent on, the occurrence of the action denoted by the imperative; virtually, therefore, it stands upon the same footing, and may thus be enunciated in the same terms—the collocation of the two verbs indicating with sufficient clearness the relation which they are conceived by the speaker or writer to occupy with regard to each other. And this *dependency* may be exhibited in English in more ways than one: sometimes a double imperative will be sufficient, at other times it will be better to adopt the form of an explicit hypothetical, or to employ the final conjunction *that* before the second verb.

Examples are not far to find: Qor'an xxvii. 12 put thy hand into thy bosom, *let it come forth* white, or, as we should say, *and it shall* come forth white. ii. 38 be true to my covenant, أَوْفِ (juss.) *let me be true* to yours! i. e. '*if* you are true to me, I will be true to you,' 129 become Jews or Christians, *be guided aright* (juss.), or, *that* you may be guided aright (contrast vii. 158). iii. 29 if you love God, follow me; *let* God *love* you, and *forgive* you your sins, or, *then* he will love you etc. (by inserting *then*, we assume that the 'following' has actually occurred, and so are enabled to employ the language of assurance—*will;* Arabic and Hebrew do *not* make this assumption, and are therefore obliged to adhere to an expression of contingency, in strict co-ordination with the imperative). vii. 71 (cf. xi. 67. xl. 27) let her alone, تَأْكُلْ *let her eat* = that she may eat, 139, 142, 161. xl. 62 *if* you call upon me, I will answer you. xlvi. 30. lvii. 28 fear God, and believe in his prophet, *let him give* (= '*that* he may give;' or, '*and* he will give,' viz. provided that you fear and believe) you a double portion of his mercy. lxvii. 4 etc.

The instances here cited (all of which are in exact conformity with the type קַח . . . יְהִי) form a welcome illustration of the Hebrew idiom. It ought, however, to be mentioned that as a general rule in

Arabic the jussive, when used in its etymological sense, never stands alone, but is preceded by the particle ل *li:* in the class of instances under discussion the need of this seems to be superseded by the presence of the *imperative*, which sufficiently indicates the sense to be assigned to the jussive following[1].

152. But however this may be, the formulae in question are of frequent occurrence. We have—

(i) *The hypothetical imperative:*—as 2 Chron. xx. 20 *Trust in Yahweh and prosper:* this *may*, of course, be a special counsel issued on a particular occasion, but it may likewise be intended to have a more general purport and to affirm that *granting* or *supposing* the first imperative to take effect at any time, the second will be found to take effect also. Gen. xlii. 18 do this וְחִיוּ *and live:* as the *living* is dependent upon the *doing*, if the double imperative is not perfectly unambiguous in English we may substitute one of these more explicit and equivalent forms 'do this *that* ye may live,' or 'if ye do this, ye will live.' Is. lv. 2, 3. Jer. xxv. 5. xxxv. 15. Amos v. 4, 6 (וחיו, for which *v.* 14 למען תחיו). Ps. xxxvii. 27. Prov. iii. 3 f. ('*and so* find,' or '*that* thou mayest find'). iv. 4 *b.* vi. 3 *a.* vii. 2. ix. 6. xiii. 20 Kt. (Del.). xxiii. 19. xxvii. 11. Job xxii. 21; or in irony or defiance, Is. viii. 9 vex yourselves *and be broken!* 1 Kings xxii. 12, 15: cf. p. 54[3].

And without וְ:—Prov. xx. 13. Job xl. 32 lay thine hand upon him, זְכֹר *think of* the battle, אַל־תּוֹסַף׃ *don't* do it again! (i. e. thou wilt not do it again.)

(ii) The same with a jussive* (or[2] cohortative †) in the

---

[1] Compare Ewald, *Gram. Arab.* § 732; Wright, ii. §§ 13, 17.

[2] In the instances marked thus * or †, the presence of the voluntative is indicated by the form.

apodosis[1]:—Is. viii. 10 (ironically) take your counsel וְתֻפָר *and let it come* to nought! Gen. xxx. 28†. xxxiv. 12†. Prov. iii. 9 f., 21 f. iv. 6, 8 (xix. 20 למען), 10. xvi. 3. xx. 22*. xxv. 5. xxxi. 6 f. (yet לא in apod.). Job xii. 7.

And without וְ:—

Ex. vii. 9* 'take thy rod and cast it to the ground, יְהִי *let it become* a serpent!' but as this is the object aimed at by the two preceding actions, we may also render *that it may become*. xviii. 19 שמע איעצך. Ps. xxi. 14†. xxxiv. 12. l. 15. li. 16 (*that* my tongue may sing). lxxxvi. 11 *a*. cxviii. 19. cxix. 17 (=*so* or *then* shall I live, although without וְ), 145†. Prov. iii. 7 f.* תְּהִי. Job i. 11. ii. 5. 2 Chron. xxv. 8.

(iii) *The double jussive*:—Is. xli. 28 וְאֶרֶא ואין איש and *suppose* (*if*) I looked, there was no man. Mic. vi. 14 (ולא תפליט in apod.). Ps. xci. 15. civ. 20* תָּשֶׁת חֹשֶׁךְ וְיִהִי לָיְלָה=*if* or *when* thou makest darkness, then it is night, 32 *b*. cxlvii. 18 *a*. Prov. xx. 25 יָלַע (cf. p. 113[3]) let a man cry hastily, It is sacred, and afterwards he will have to enquire into his vows! (to see whether he can free himself from them: in *b* understand יְהִי). xxvii. 17* Del. Job xxii. 28 *a**. xxxiv. 29 *b* (and *if he hides* ויסתר: in the similar sentence *a* ישקט); perhaps Hos. vi. 1 *b*.

And without וְ:—

2 Kings vi. 27 (where notice אַל in protasis: the sense

---

[1] Compare above, §§ 62, 64 *Obs.*, where indeed such of the instances here quoted as bear reference to a definite individual act might, perhaps, have been better placed: but the imperative followed by the jussive forms such a characteristic idiom that it seemed preferable to collect all the examples under a single head; it will, of course, depend upon the context whether a particular instance is to be understood hypothetically or not.

of the passage is, however, uncertain). Ps. civ. 22, 28, 29, 30. cix. 25. cxxxix. 18 *a*. cxlvi. 4. cxlvii. 18 *b*. Prov. i. 23†. xxvi. 26 (תִּגָּלֶה in apod.). Job ix. 34 f.† x. 16 f.* xi. 17 : תִּעָפֶה כַּבֹּקֶר תִּהְיֶה *suppose* it dark, 'twill become like the morning. xx. 24. xxxvii. 4 *a*. Cf. 2 Sam. xviii. 22 וְיִהִי מָה אֲרָצָה־נָּא גַם־אָנִי well, come what may, *I* too will run.

(iv) Once or twice only is the jussive followed by an imperative :—Ps. xlv. 12 (?); cf. Gen. xx. 7 (Hitz.). Job xv. 17.

153. Lastly, some passages must be noted in which the thought is *virtually* hypothetical; although this is in no way indicated by its syntactical dress :—

Prov. xi. 2 בָּא זָדוֹן וַיָּבֹא קָלוֹן *lit.* 'pride *has come and* shame *goes on to come,*' i. e. follows it in any given case : this compound *general truth* (§ 12) is equivalent in meaning, though not in form, to the *explicit* hypothetical construction '*if* or *when* pride cometh, then cometh shame' (cf. xviii. 3 *a*). So xi. 8. xxv. 4 (where we should be on our guard against allowing English idiom to mislead us into treating הָנוֹ imperatively, as *v.* 5, which the following וַיֵּצֵא forbids : the *inf. abs.* is here a substitute for the *perfect*). Job iii. 25 *a*. xx. 15 *a*, cf. 25 *a*. xxiii. 13 his soul hath a desire and he doeth it (='*if* it hath' etc.). xxix. 11 (here, however, as elsewhere, provided the English will bear it, it is better to keep the *form* of the Hebrew, rather than with Auth. Vers. to alter it : the rhythm of the original is certainly more stately and effective than that of the translation). xxxvii. 21 ; xxii. 29 for they are depressed (perf. proph.: cf. נָנַהּ 28 *b*) וְתֹאמֶר and thou sayest, Up! (the constr. of Del. Dillm. seems to me next to impossible). These passages throw light upon Ex. xx. 25 *b* for thou hast lifted up thy sword upon it and defiled it! i. e. *if* thou liftest up thy sword upon it, thou defilest it.

Cf. also Ps. xxxvii. 10 *b* (where ו cannot be conversive on account of the position of the tone: contrast Prov. iii. 24).

154. Often this *hypothetical* perfect, as it may be termed, is followed by the impf. *ἀσυνδέτως* (cf. § 84 *end*): thus Amos iii. 8 a lion *hath roared*, who shall not be afraid? (i. e. *supposing* it have roared). Job vii. 20 חָטָאתִי *have I sinned* (repeated xxxv. 6 with אם: that the perfect is hypothetical is, of course, further clear from the whole tenour of 'Iyob's argument), what do I do to thee? Lev. xv. 3. Ps. lvii. 4 probably. lxix. 33. Prov. xix. 24. xxii. 29. xxvi. 12. Job iv. 21. xix. 4. xxi. 31. xxiii. 10. xxiv. 24. Cf. Hos. ix. 6: also Prov. xxii. 3 Kt. Lam. i. 21 *c*: Ps. ciii. 16. cxxxix. 18. Prov. xii. 7. Job vii. 8. xxvii. 19.

More rarely it is succeeded by another perfect, as Prov. xxiv. 10. xxvi. 15. xxvii. 12 (contrast xxii. 3): or by an imperative, Prov. xxv. 16.

155. Only very seldom do we meet with what seems like one of the hypothetical constructions noticed above, with the *omission* of the conditional particle:—Josh. xxii. 18. Neh. i. 8. Ps. lxii. 10 (cf. § 136); Is. xxvi. 10 (§ 136 *γ*); Lev. x. 19 וְאָכַלְתִּי and had I eaten, would it be good in the eyes of Yahweh? Num. xii. 14 (cf. § 144).

Obs. Whether it is permissible to explain Hos. viii. 12. Ps. xl. 6 by means of the principle of § 152 is very doubtful, as nowhere else does the *perfect* appear in the apodosis: Is. lviii. 10 may perhaps be included on the strength of Prov. xxxi. 6 f. Mic. vi. 14.

APPENDIX I.

The Circumstantial Clause.

156. THE term *circumstantial*, or, as the German word[1] is sometimes though perhaps less expressively rendered, *descriptive clause*, is one which constantly meets the student in the commentaries and grammars of modern scholars: and formulating as it does a characteristic usage of the language, its introduction has been of great service in the rational exposition of Hebrew syntax. It corresponds on the whole to what in the classical languages is generally termed the *secondary predicate*. Any word or words expressive of some fact *subordinate to the main course of the narrative*, or descriptive of some circumstance attaching or appertaining to the action denoted by the principal verb, may form a circumstantial clause or secondary predicate: an adverb, a genitive or ablative absolute, a participle or other word in apposition to the subject—all of which *qualify* the main action by assigning the *con-*

---

[1] *Zustandsatz*, also *Umstandsatz*. With the whole of what follows compare generally Ewald, §§ 306 *c*, 341, who, however, seems to me to extend the principle of the circumstantial clause beyond legitimate or reasonable limits, to cases where its application can only be deemed artificial and unreal.

comitant conditions under which it took place, be they modal, causal, or temporal—are familiar instances. But Hebrew has no signs for cases, no past or future participle, a limited development of adverbs or adjectives, and is weak in special words corresponding to conjunctions like ὡς ἐπεὶ, quum etc.: in what way, then, is it able to give expression to these subordinate details which although secondary, nevertheless form such an important and even indispensable factor in all continued narrative?

157. Already in the preceding pages, while considering the various mutual relations to one another of the different clauses which together constitute a complete sentence, we have more than once had occasion to notice how in Hebrew, to a much greater extent than in many other languages, these relations take the form of simple *co-ordination:* in other words, that, instead of the logical relation which each part bears to the whole being explicitly indicated, it is frequently left to be inferred by the reader for himself with just such help as he may be able to obtain from a change of position, or an alteration in the modulation of the voice. Now a similar method is employed for the expression of those circumstantial clauses which modern idiom usually marks more distinctly[1]. The words expressing them are simply *thrown into the sentence*, being

---

[1] In early Greek we not unfrequently observe the same phenomenon: thus Il. vi. 148 ἔαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη, which is logically subordinate to the preceding clause ἄλλα δέ θ' ὕλη Τηλεθόωσα φύει, of which it determines the moment of occurrence: grammatically, however, it is *co*-ordinated with it. So xiv. 417. xvi. 825. xvii. 302 μὐννθάδιος δέ οἱ αἰὼν Ἔπλετο (והוא קצר ימים), 572. xviii. 247 f. xxi. 364. xxii. 27 ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαὶ Φαίνονται, his beams *shining* brightly.

either entirely disconnected with what precedes or joined to it only by וְ—with a change, however, of the usual order of the words, whereby the construction with וַ, expressive of the smooth and unbroken succession of events one after another, is naturally abandoned, as being alien to the relation that has now to be represented, and the *subject* of the circumstantial clause *placed first.* In consequence of the subject thus standing conspicuously in the foreground, the reader's attention is suddenly arrested, and directed pointedly to it: he is thus made aware that it is the writer's wish to lay special stress upon it as about to be contrasted, in respect of the predicate following, either with some *other* subject mentioned before, or else with the same subject under a *different* aspect (i. e. with a different predicate) previously mentioned or implied. The contrast may at times be hardly perceptible, and so possibly be thought not to exist: but this is no more than happens with μὲν . . . δὲ in Greek, which always mark an antithesis of some sort or other, however evanescent it may sometimes appear. For instance, 1 Kings xix. 19 'and he went thence and found 'Elisha', וְהוּא חֹרֵשׁ and *he* (was) ploughing:' this is equivalent to 'while he was ploughing,' where it will be observed that the italics for *he* are abandoned: so soon as the circumstantial clause is expressed by a conjunction, there is not generally any further need to emphasize the subject, the particular relation which the emphasis was intended to bring out being now represented with sufficient force by the connecting particle.

As to the verb (if there be one) following the subject, it will naturally fall into the pf., impf., or partcp., according to the character of the circumstance to be described and

its relation in point of time to the action denoted by the verb in the primary sentence.

158. In the translation of circumstantial clauses there is considerable scope for variety. Sometimes the וְ may be rendered most simply and naturally *and*—the subordinate position of the fact thus introduced being manifest from the sense of the passage, especially if the emphasis which in the original is produced by position, or by the insertion of the personal pronoun, otherwise both unusual and unneeded, is made apparent in the translation by the only idiomatic equivalent we possess, viz. the use of *italics*. The precise meaning of a sentence is often wholly determined by the emphatic word in it: how then is the reader to ascertain which the emphatic word is? In a more flexible language than our own, this is frequently indicated by a simple change of position: occasionally the same course is open to us in English, but to a far more limited extent: the only practical alternative remaining by which the reader may be instructed how to throw the words of such a sentence into their proper relation to each other is the employment of italics—an expedient at once natural, legitimate, and usual. At other times, on the contrary, it will be better, precisely as in the case of the participle in Greek or Latin, to make the meaning more evident by the adoption of some circumlocution such as *if*, *when*, *although*, *as*, *since*, etc., as the context requires.

159. Let us first consider some instances in which the conjunction appears:—Gen. xviii. 12, 18. xxiv. 56 delay me not וַיהוָה הִצְלִיחַ דַּרְכִּי *and* Yahweh hath prospered my journey, i. e. *since* or *when* he has prospered it. Ruth i. 21 why call ye me No'omi, וַיהוָה עָנָה בִי *when*

or *seeing* Yahweh hath testified against me? Josh. iii. 14 וְהַכֹּהֲנִים *the priests being* before the people, 15 *b* (may be most conveniently placed in a parenthesis: LXX ὁ δὲ Ἰορδάνης ἐπληροῦτο· δὲ being used as Thuk. i. 93. 4 ὑπῆρκτο δὲ κ. τ. λ., or as in the phrases σημεῖον δέ· δῆλον δέ· i. 11. 2 etc.). xxiii. 1. Gen. xviii. 16 LXX Ἀβραὰμ δὲ הֹלֵךְ συνεπορεύετο (for which we might have had τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ συμπορευομένου). 2 Kings viii. 7 Benhadad *being sick.* Jer. xxxiv. 1. Job xxxiii. 19 Qri *while* or *though* the multitude of his bones is in vigour. Esth. ii. 21. Num. xxiv 18 *while* or *as* Israel doeth valiantly. Ex. xvi. 7 *b* (justifying the words in *a* על יהוה, exactly as in Num. xvi. 11 *b*). xviii. 14. 2 Chron. xx. 17 *b*. And with the subject *repeated* from the previous clause, Ex. xiv. 8. Judg. viii. 11 and he smote the camp, והמחנה היה בטח *the camp being* secure. 1 Kings i. 40. xviii. 3. Deut. iv. 11.

Gen. ix. 23. xi. 4 וְרֹאשׁוֹ בַשָּׁמַיִם *with* its top in the heavens. xii. 6. xiii. 7. xliv. 26. 2 Chron. xxiii. 7. Is. xliii. 8 ועינים יש *although* they have eyes. Ps. xxviii. 3 וְרָעָה בִּלְבָבָם *while* or *though* mischief is in their hearts. lv. 22 *a*. lxiv. 7. Prov. iii. 28 וְיֵשׁ אִתְּךָ: *it being* by thee. xii. 9. xiii. 7. xv. 16. xvii. 1.

Often in phrases such as וְאֵין מַצִּיל Is. v. 29. Ps. vii. 3. l. 22. Job v. 4 etc.; ואין מקבץ Is. xiii. 14; ואין מחריד *without any to frighten*, Lev. xxvi. 6. Job xi. 19 etc.; ואין קבר 2 Kings ix. 10.

Only very seldom is וְ in a circumstantial clause followed by some word other than the subject: cf. 2 Kings x. 2. Ps. lx. 13 (=cviii. 13). Josh. xxii. 25. Is. iii. 7. An exception is, however, formed by the emphatic word לֹא; as Ps. xliv. 18 ולא שכחנוהו *when* or *though* we had not (or *without* our having) forgotten him. Job xi. 11. xxiv. 22 he recovers

ולא יאמין *while* (*when* or *though*) despairing of life (i. e. during an illness). xlii. 3 *without* understanding. Dan. xii. 8; cf. Cant. iii. 4.

160. The most instructive and noticeable instances, however, are those in which a *personal pronoun* forms the subject of the circumstantial clause: where this is the case, it is often even more impracticable than before to elicit a suitable or intelligible meaning without resolving the Hebrew idiom into some relatival or participial construction. Thus Gen. xviii. 13. xxiv. 62 וְהוּא יֹשֵׁב *as* or *for* he was dwelling (assigning a reason for *a*, quite different from וַיֵּשֶׁב xxv. 11, where the וַ introduces a new and independent statement). xxxvii. 2 וְהוּא נַעַר *he being* a lad (*while yet* a lad, LXX ὢν νέος). xliv. 14. Ex. xxiii. 9 'for *ye* know.' xxxiii. 12 thou sayest to me, Bring up this people, ואתה לא הודעתני *without having* told me etc. Josh. xvii. 14 why hast thou given me only a single lot, ואני עם רב *seeing* I am a great people? Judg. iii. 26 and Ehud escaped וְהוּא עָבַר *he having passed over* etc. (not the mere addition of a fresh fact like וַיַּעֲבֹר, but the justification of the preceding נִמְלָט). iv. 21 וְהוּא־יָרֵדֵם (pf.) *he having* fallen fast asleep. xvi. 20 οὐκ εἰδώς, 31 *after having* judged (so 1 Sam. iv. 18). 2 Sam. iv. 5 *b*, 10. 1 Kings i. 41 וְהֵם כִּלּוּ *they having* finished. xi. 29. xx. 12 וְהוּא שֹׁתֶה *while* drinking, cf. *v.* 16. 2 Kings ii. 18. v. 18. Is. xlii. 22 (the reality contrasted with the intention, *v.* 21). xlix. 21. liii. 4 *although* we thought him, 5 *but* HE (in reality, opposed to 4 *b*) etc., 7 (where the unemphatic 'and he was afflicted' is obviously inadequate to represent והוא נענה: the words must signify either '*he being* (already) afflicted,' or (Delitzsch) 'though suffering himself to be afflicted:' only in this way is a contrast with נגש secured), 12 (not

'and he bare,' Auth. Vers., which must have been וַיִּסְבֹּל: the point is that he was numbered with transgressors, *although* actually so far from being one himself, that he had even borne the sin of others). Jer. xi. 10 והמה הלכו *in that* they went. Hos. iii. 1 *although* they turn. vii. 9. Ps. l. 17 (in contrast to *v.* 16). lv. 22 *b being* (in reality) drawn swords. Job ii. 8. xxi. 22 והוא רמים ישפוט *while* or *when* HE judges those that are on high. xxii. 18 *when* HE (of whom they had used the language quoted in *v.* 17) *had* all the time filled their houses with prosperity. 2 Chron. x. 2 והוא *he being* in Egypt. xxii. 9. xxxiv. 3.

Obs. We must be careful, however, not to suppose that *all* sentences framed like ושאול אמר are circumstantial clauses: sometimes emphasis or the love of variety appears to cause this form to be adopted in preference to ויאמר שאול; especially noticeable are those cases where, when statements have to be made respecting *two* subjects, the first having been introduced by וְ, the second is thrown into relief against the first by *the subject being placed before the verb.* This variation is the Hebrew equivalent to *μὲν . . . δὲ* of the Greeks: in English the antithesis is not indicated by anything further than a slightly emphasized pronunciation.

Thus Gen. iv. 2 And Hébel was (or rather *became*—היה is *ἐγίγνετο, γίγνεται* much more than *ἦν, ἐστὶ*) a shepherd, וקין היה but Qáyin was (became and continued to be) a tiller of ground, 3 f. (with גם הוא added, as 20–22. xix. 38 al.). vi. 8. viii. 5. x. 8, 13, 15 (facts about the personages named *v.* 6, and so contrasted among each other), 24, 26. xi. 3 *b.* xiii. 12. xiv. 10 *b.* xviii. 33. xix. 24.

Similarly when something has to be stated about a *new* subject, that subject is sometimes put first, though by no means exclusively, as Gen. xi. 12, 14 (contrast 13, 15), but in the exactly similar sentences 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26 we have וְ: then 27 *b* והרן הוליד. xiii. 14. xiv. 18. xxvi. 26. xxxi. 29. xxxvi. 12 etc.

A third case in which the same order of words is observed is for the purpose of introducing the mention of a new state of things, or new situation, which, while preparatory to what is to succeed, is in no immediate connection with the preceding portion of the narra-

tive. Those instances in which the fresh fact is one that is *anterior* to the point at which the main narrative has arrived, have been already adverted to and explained pp. 92 f., where also an obvious reason was assigned for the abandonment upon such occasions of the more usual construction with ·וַ. Although, however, the new statement is introductory, and accordingly in a certain sense subordinate, to what follows, yet the subordination is not sufficient to create a formal circumstantial clause; moreover, the clause in question precedes instead of following the sentence it is supposed to qualify: in fact the change of form merely marks the commencement of a new thread which is afterwards interwoven with the narrative as a whole. The deviation from the usual style of progression, and also the significance of the new one adopted in its place, may be appropriately indicated in translation by the employment of *now*. Thus, in addition to the passages cited p. 93, see Gen. xvi. 1 *Now* Sarai, Abram's wife, had borne him no son (contrast xi. 30). xxxiv. 5, 7 (5 is introductory to 6, just as 7 is to 8; chronologically ויצא 6 is evidently the continuation of 4. Observe also that 6 *b* states Chămór's *design* in coming out, but before it can be carried out the state of things described in 7 has supervened: accordingly we have אתם 8 instead of אחו as in 6). xxxvii. 3 *now* Israel loved. xxxix. 1. xliii. 1. Ex. xiii. 21. Josh. xiii. 1. 2 Kings iii. 1, 4, 21. v. 1. vi. 8, 32.

The preceding remarks apply with no less force to those cases in which the subject is a *pronoun*, to sentences, for example, of a type so common in the Psalms, beginning with ואני, ואתה etc. Although, in thus inserting the pronoun, it is always the intention of the writer to mark it as being in *some* way specially emphatic—either as denoting a *different* subject, which is to be contrasted with a previous one, or as introducing a fresh and emphatic statement about the *same* subject—yet the clause in which it appears need not of necessity be *subordinate* to what has preceded: on the contrary, its importance may render it *parallel* and *co-ordinate*, and in this case it cannot, of course, be regarded as a circumstantial clause. Thus Gen. xxxiii. 3 *he himself* (in opposition to the persons named *v.* 2). xlii. 8 ('but *they*'), 23 LXX αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν ὅτι ἀκούει (שֹׁמֵעַ *was* hearing) Ἰωσήφ. xliv. 5 ('and *he*,' a man so great as he is, איש אשר כמני 15). xlix. 13 *b* (as *v.* 20, הוא appears to point emphatically back to the subject in *a*: 19 *b* on the contrary, the fresh thought added

is in contrast to *a*). Ex. xxxvi. 3 וְהֵם and *they* (the latter). Num. xxii. 5 and *he* (this terrible people) is now abiding over against me. Judg. iv. 3. xiii. 5 (and *he*—however others may fail—will etc.: cf. Gen. xvi. 12. Mat. i. 21 αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει κ.τ.λ.). xviii. 27. 1 Sam. xxv. 37 (opposed to לבו). 1 Kings i. 13 *he* (and no one else: so *vv.* 24, 30, 35). ii. 8. xix. 4 (opposed to נערו). Is. xxxii. 8. xliii. 4. l. 5 and *I* (on my part). Hos. ii. 10. vii. 13. Amos ii. 9, 10 (it was *I* who etc.). Ps. ii. 6 but *I* (however ye may rage). ix. 9. xxxi. 7 *b* (in contrast to השמרים *a*). xxxvii. 5. lv. 23. lxxviii. 38. lxxxvii. 5. xcv. 5, 10. cvi. 43 והמה ימרו but *they* (nevertheless, in spite of יצילם) kept rebelling. Job xxi. 31, 32. xxxiv. 29. xxxvii. 12. Lam. i. 4.

It is sometimes difficult, without a careful study of the context, to discern the motive which prompted the insertion of the pronoun: let the reader examine for himself, with the view to discover in each instance what the motive may have been, the following passages:—Gen. xli. 15. Ex. xxviii. 5. Num. xxi. 26. Judg. xi. 35. 2 Sam. xix. 33 (see xvii. 27). 1 Kings x. 25. xxii. 32. 2 Kings iv. 40. xii. 6. xix. 37. Ps. cix. 25[1].

In the same way sentences introduced by וְהִנֵּה form in general such an integral part of the narrative that they can hardly with fairness be termed circumstantial clauses: certainly they often indicate a state of things either already completed (*pf.*), continuing (*part.*), or about to commence (*impf.*), but the manner of their introduction by the particle הִנֵּה, and their occurrence usually after some verb of *seeing*, *ascertaining*, *perceiving*, shews that the stress lies not so much on the mere circumstance as such, but on *the impression it produces* upon the principal subject. The construction with הִנֵּה is preferred to that with ·וַ for two reasons: 1. to mark the occurrence of an event more or less startling or noticeable for the subject; 2. to indicate with greater precision than is possible by ·וַ alone the relation as regards time of the new event to what precedes it in the sentence—whether, for instance, it is antecedent or simultaneous.

Thus Gen. viii. 13 and he looked *and behold* the face of the ground חרבו *had become* dry (LXX ἐξέλιπε· had the writer used ויחרבו, the

[1] The presence of the pronoun should *always* be noted in Hebrew: it is to be regretted that, italics being reserved for a different object, our version seldom affords any intimation of its occurrence.

meaning would have been ambiguous, as the drying would have been naturally supposed to *succeed* the act of looking). xxxvii. 7 (observe the two perfects ק׳ and נ׳ contrasted with the following imperfect ח׳: *had* stood up, *began* to move round, *v.* 9 we have the participle *were* bowing down). xlii. 27. Ex. ix. 7. xvi. 10 *had* appeared. Num. xvii. 12. Deut. ix. 13 I see this people, *and behold* it is a stiff-necked people. Judg. iii. 25. vii. 13 (*was* telling, *was* turning round). 2 Kings ii. 11 and often.

161. But circumstantial clauses are also of frequent occurrence without וְ: of these the simplest cases will obviously be those in which a participle, in apposition to the subject, forms the secondary predicate.

Num. xvi. 27. Judg. i. 7. viii. 4 *end.* Jer. ii. 27. xxiii. 17. Hab. ii. 15. Ps. vii. 3 פֹּרֵק. lxxviii. 4. Job xxiv. 5. xxix. 12. Ps. lxix. 4 *as* I wait[1]. 2 Sam. xii. 21 (cf. Jer. xiv. 4) for the sake of the boy חַי *while alive*, thou didst fast etc. xviii. 14 LXX *ἔτι αὐτοῦ ζῶντος.* And with the subject repeated after the participle, Ex. xxvi. 5=xxxvi. 12, cf. Num. xv. 30. Or the participle may precede the verb, Gen. xlix. 11. Ex. xiii. 18. Is. xliv. 20 'pursuing after ashes, a deceived heart has led him astray.' lvii. 19. Ps. x. 10 Kt. lvi. 2. lxxxiv. 7. xcii. 14 LXX *πεφυτευμένοι* (not *οἱ πεφ.*) . . . *ἐξανθήσουσιν*, planted in the house of Yahweh, they will flourish etc. cvii. 5. Job ix. 4. xiv. 20. xviii. 4 (מֹרֵף in app. with the suffix in הלמענך: the change of person is no more violent than in Is. liv. 1). xxiv. 10. Prov. xx. 14. Compare above, § 126.

162. Now suppose the idea expressed by the participle

---

[1] Only very seldom is the participle preceded by וְ: see 2 Sam. xiii. 20. 1 Kings vii. 7. Hab. ii. 10. Ps. lv. 20. But Ps. xxii. 29 *b* is co-ordinate to *a*: for the participle without any subject *expressed*, cf. xxxiv. 21. xxxvii. 26. 1 Sam. xvi. 11. xvii. 25. xx. 1. Is. xxi. 11. xxxiii. 5. Hab. i. 5 al.

has to be *negatived*, how is this accomplished? לא, it is well known, is not used with the partcp., except on the rarest occasions: אֵין or בְּלִי (the negative which strictly belongs to the partcp., in the same way that בִּלְתִּי is mainly appropriated to the infinitive) is employed only where special exactness is desired: nothing remains, therefore, but to allow the partcp. after לא to *lapse into the finite verb*, either tense being chosen as is most suitable to the sense.

Thus Gen. xliv. 4 לא הרחיקו (subordinate to יצאו את העיר) *without having* gone far. Ex. xxxiv. 28. Lev. xiii. 23 לא פשׂתה *without* having spread (it will be noticed that in these cases the force of the circumstantial clause with the perfect corresponds exactly to that of the Greek *aorist participle:* indeed this is the only way in which the *past* partcp. active can be represented in Hebrew); cf. Num. xxx. 12. Deut. xxi. 1 it not being known. 1 Kings v. 7 *b*. xiii. 28 *b*. xxii. 43. Job iii. 18. ix. 25.

And with the verb in the impf.:—Lev. i. 17 לא יבדיל *without* dividing it. Is. xxx. 14 לא יחמל *unsparingly*. Ezek. xxi. 3 f. לא תכבה. Ps. xxi. 12 (if בל יוכלו be regarded as qualifying חשבו). Job xxix. 24 לא יאמינו *when* or *if* they lacked confidence. xxxi. 34 not going out. Also in such phrases as לא יֵדַע, לא אֵדַע, לא אָבִין etc., or sometimes with the perfect, *without his* or *my knowing*, i. e. unexpectedly, or without understanding, 1 Kings iii. 7. Is. xlvii. 11. Ps. xxxv. 8. Prov. v. 6; and with וְ, Job xi. 11; ix. 5 וְלֹא יָדָעוּ (cf. Num. xvii. 15).

163. But the same use of the verb ἀσυνδέτως is likewise found even where there is no negative:—

Gen. xxi. 14 and gave it to Hagar, שָׂם *having placed* it (or *placing* it, if שם be partcp.) on her shoulder (cf. Judg.

vi. 19). xliv. 12 הֵחֵל LXX excellently ἀρξάμενος. xlviii. 14. Num. xi. 32; cf. 1 Kings xviii. 6. Josh. iii. 16 קָמוּ and נִכְרְתוּ (being cut off). Judg. xx. 31. 1 Kings vi. 15. xi. 27. xiii. 18 (ψευσάμενος αὐτῷ). Ezek. xii. 7. Ps. lxxviii. 19. Is. v. 11 *while* wine inflames them; and probably Ps. vii. 7. lvii. 4. lxxi. 3. cxix. 126 הֵפֵרוּ תּוֹרָתֶךָ they have made void thy law (assigning a reason for *a*).

164. The secondary predicate is often expressed in a short clause without a verb, introduced by אֵין, בְּלִי etc.; so in the phrase אֵין מִסְפָּר *without number*, Jer. ii. 32. Joel i. 6. Job xxi. 33. Ct. vi. 8 (and with וְ Ps. civ. 25. cv. 34); cf. 1 Kings xxii. 1 אֵין מִלְחָמָה. Ex. xxi. 11 אין כסף. Ps. lxxxviii. 5 like a man אֵין אֵיל *without* strength. Lam. v. 3 Kt. Job viii. 11. xxiv. 10 naked, they walk up and down (Pi'el) בְּלִי לְבוּשׁ *without* covering. xxxi. 39. xxxiii. 9. xxxiv. 6 (cf. Ps. lix. 5); 2 Sam. xxiii. 4 a morning לֹא עָבוֹת *without* clouds (or, idiomatically, *a cloudless* morning). Job xii. 24 בתהו לא דרך in the *pathless* waste. xxxiv. 24. xxxviii. 26 *a*[1].

165. In almost all the preceding examples, the circumstantial clause has been *appended* to the principal sentence: we have, however, already met with a few instances in which a participial clause was prefixed (see § 161), and we shall soon find that such a position is by no means uncommon, or confined to the participle alone.

If we compare a sentence such as 1 Kings xiii. 20 with one like *v.* 23, we shall at once see that the participial clause הֵם יֹשְׁבִים in the former is, in position and force,

[1] Most of these instances are from Gesenius' *Thesaurus*: it is not necessary, as is there done, to explain them as elliptical constructions for בבלי, בלא.

the precise counterpart of the adverbial clause אַחֲרֵי אָכְלוֹ וג׳ in the latter; and that like it, it notifies a circumstance strictly subordinate to the main narrative, in a manner exactly reproducible in Greek by the use of the gen. abs. (LXX *καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν καθημένων κ.τ.λ.*). The participle as thus used is frequent, especially in the historical books: from the analogy of the corresponding expressions in the classical languages, it may be appropriately termed *the participle absolute.*

Thus Gen. xlii. 35 and it came to pass, הֵם מְרִיקִים *as they were emptying* their sacks, that they found etc. 1 Sam. xxv. 20. 2 Kings ii. 11. vi. 5 הָאֶחָד מַפִּיל *as* one was felling. viii. 5 LXX *αὐτοῦ ἐξηγουμένου.* Job xli. 18. If it is required to express *past* time, the perfect naturally takes the place of the participle:—Gen. xxvii. 30 and it came to pass, אַךְ יָצֹא יָצָא יַעֲקֹב Ya'qob *having* only just gone out, that 'Esau his brother came in. Josh. iv. 18 נתקו. 1 Kings xxi. 1. 2 Kings xii. 7 *b.* xx. 4. 1 Chron. xv. 29. And add Gen. xv. 17 ויהי השמש בֹּאה, a passage in which the *perfect* shews convincingly (quite apart from considerations of gender) that ויהי must not be taken closely with השמש: rather 'and it came to pass, *the sun having gone down*, that' etc. We now see further how to take *v.* 12 'and it came to pass, השמש לבוא *the sun being about to go down*, that' etc.; cf. Josh. ii. 5 (for the inf. with ל see Gesenius, § 132, rem. 1; Kalisch, § 98. 6, who, however, seem to explain these passages incorrectly: the inf. with ל may form a complete clause by itself without היה, as both shew by other instances they themselves quote, e.g. Is. xxxviii. 20. 2 Chron. xi. 22).

With Gen. xv. 17 compare also Jer. xxxvii. 13. 2 Chron. xxi. 9 וַיְהִי קָם לַיְלָה וַיַּךְ, where ויהי קם are not to be con-

nected (like וַיְהִי בֹּנֶה Gen. iv. 17 etc.), but קָם (pf.)=*having arisen*, as 2 Kings viii. 21 ויהי הוא קם לילה ויכה clearly proves.

The analogous construction in the future is found Josh. xxii. 18. 1 Kings xviii. 12.

166. In the instances cited the participle may fairly be held to express a circumstantial clause. But what are we to say of those instances in which no ויהי precedes, for example, 1 Kings xiv. 17 הִיא בָּאָה וְהַנַּעַר מֵת, or Gen. xliv. 3 הַבֹּקֶר אוֹר וְהָאֲנָשִׁים שֻׁלְּחוּ? Unquestionably, they *might* be explained upon the same principle: the וְ, or rarer וַ (Judg. vii. 19, cf. below, § 169 *Obs.*), being no longer able to attach itself to an antecedent וַיְהִי (see § 78) would in that case, as we have seen it do before in undoubted instances, §§ 127, 128, mark the apodosis. On the other hand, this use of וְ is decidedly exceptional, and it must be admitted that, as one *reads* the sentences in question, such an explanation appears unnatural and strained; in fact, the first clause *sounds* as though it were *parallel* to the second, not subordinate. And had the writer wished to express this subordination, he could readily have written וַיְהִי כְּבֹאָהּ וַיָּמֶת הַנַּעַר (or, preserving the same order, § 78. 3, וְהַנַּעַר מֵת). As a general rule, a time or place-determination takes certainly a secondary position: but is it necessary that it should do so always? may it not be sometimes intended by placing it on an independent footing, and so arresting the mind for a moment on what is ordinarily a mere passing detail, to confer some additional vividness upon the scene described? And does the rendering 'as soon as the morning dawned, the men were sent away' succeed in fully reproducing the *effect* made upon the ear by the words of the original? Surely this, 'the

morning dawned, and the men were sent away,' is a truer representation of their real force: the same antithetical structure is still retained, and the two clauses still balance one another with the same rhythmical precision.

167. And in fact, even in Greek and Latin, time-determinations do not by any means occupy always a subordinate position: in graphic or elevated writing particularly they are often placed on one and the same level with the rest of the narrative. A few instances are worth citing:—Il. xix. 1–3. Dem. *de cor.* § 218 *ἑσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἦν, ἧκε δ' ἀγγέλλων τις· ὡς τοὺς πρυτάνεις ὡς Ἐλάτεια κατείληπται·* how much fuller and richer the picture, than if the orator had simply said, *ἑσπέρας γὰρ ἧκεν ἀγγέλλων τις κ.τ.λ.*, or employed a word like *ἐπειδή*! Soph. Phil. 354 ff. *ἦν δ' ἡμαρ ἤδη δεύτερον πλέοντί μοι Κἀγὼ πικρὸν Σίγειον οὐρίῳ πλάτῃ Κατηγόμην.* Thuk. i. 50. 6 *ἤδη δ' ἦν ὀψὲ καὶ ἐπεπαιώνιστο αὐτοῖς ὡς ἐς ἐπίπλουν καὶ οἱ Κορίνθιοι ἐξαπίνης πρύμναν ἐκρούοντο·* iv. 69. 3. Hdt. iii. 108 *end.* iv. 181. 5 *μεσαμβρίη τέ ἐστι, καὶ τὸ κάρτα γίγνεται ψυχρόν*, 'it is noon, and the water becomes quite cold,' 6 *παρέρχονταί τε μέσαι νύκτες καὶ ψύχεται μέχρι ἐς ἠῶ.* Liv. xliii. 4 'vixdum ad consulem se pervenisse, *et* audisse oppidum expugnatum' etc. Verg. Georg. ii. 80 Conington, 'nec longum tempus, *et* ingens Exiit ad caelum ramis felicibus arbos.' Aen. iii. 9 and often.

168. But it will be objected, If this be all, why the peculiar form assumed in the passages in question, which in others becomes even more striking still, as 1 Sam. ix. 11[1] הֵמָּה עֹלִים . . . וְהֵמָּה מֹצְאוּ? why, if nothing more be intended by the writer, was he not satisfied with the more

---

[1] Cf. Hdt. iii. 76. 2 *ἔν τε δὴ τῇ ὁδῷ μέσῃ στείχοντες ἐγίνοντο, καὶ τὰ περὶ Πρηξάσπεα γεγονότα ἐπυνθάνοντο.*

simple and obvious form וַיִּמָּצֵא . . . וַיַּעַל? (cf. above, § 149 *note*.) The answer is evident. Such a form, being wholly devoid of emphasis, would not have suited his purpose. He wishes to mark as forcibly as he can the time at which a given event took place, *with reference to another event*. In order to do this, he makes the latter prominent, by *elevating* it from the lower position it commonly holds, and causing it to *confront* the former as conspicuously and decidedly as the language will permit. In the passages from the Iliad and Demosthenes this antithetical relation is indicated by the *μὲν . . . δέ*: in Hebrew it can only be expressed by the position of the two subjects—both, contrary to the usual custom (at least with nouns) by which the *verb* stands first, being placed in the foreground. Thus in היא באה והנער מת two actions to *different* subjects, in המה עלים והמה מצאו two actions of the *same* subject are thrown into strong contrast with each other: and the special relation they are intended to bear to one another is made keenly palpable.

169. We may now collect the principal passages in which this construction is employed:—Gen. xxxviii. 25 הִוא מוֹצֵאת וְהִיא שָׁלְחָה; LXX *αὐτὴ δὲ ἀγομένη ἀπέστειλε*, Auth. Vers. 'when she was brought forth, she sent' etc., which certainly expresses roughly the *sense* of the original, but is it an accurate representation of its *spirit*—of the *idea* which the writer by his choice of a phrase wished to suggest to the mind? do we see with the same force and clearness as in the more literal 'she was being brought forth, when she sent to her father-in-law' the picture הוא מוצאת, upon which he dwells? Judg. xviii. 3; and with a change of subject, xix. 11. 1 Sam. xx. 36 הנער

רץ והוא ירה. 2 Sam. xx. 8. 2 Kings ii. 23 והוא עֹלֶה ונערים יצאו. iv. 5. ix. 25. Job i. 16, 17[1].

We find עוֹד in the first clause, Gen. xxix. 9 עודנו מדבר ורחל בָּאה he was still speaking, *when* Rachel entered in. Num. xi. 33. Ps. lxxviii. 30 f. 1 Kings i. 22, 42 (cf. of future time *v.* 14). 2 Kings vi. 33. Job i. 16, 17. Dan. ix. 20 f.; and וְהִנֵּה in the second clause, Judg. xix. 22. 1 Sam. ix. 14. xvii. 23. Job i. 18 *b*–19.

If the sense demands it, a *perfect* may of course stand in the first clause:—Gen. xix. 23. xliv. 3, 4 הם יצאו ויוסף אמר they had gone out of the city, *and* (or *when*) Joseph said. Judg. iii. 24 והוא יצא ועבדיו באו now *he* had gone out, when his servants came in. xx. 39 f. 2 Sam. ii. 24 al.: cf. also Gen. vii. 6. xix. 4. xxiv. 45, and above, § 128.

Obs. The second clause is exceptionally introduced by כִּי; Judg. vii. 19 (אַךְ = *hardly*, as Gen. xxvii. 30; cf. אַף 2 Kings ii. 14. Is. xl. 24). viii. 4 f.[2]

---

[1] What are we to do with 2 Kings x. 12 f. הוא בית עקד . . . ויהוא מצא, where the pronoun *followed* by the subject to which it refers is unparalleled? I am inclined to think that for ויהוא we ought to read והוא: the change is very slight, and would at once bring the passage into exact conformity with Judg. xviii. 3 etc.

[2] Ewald adds 2 Sam. xi. 4, joining והיא מ׳ to what *follows*, and saying, 'das *part.* dem sinne nach beinahe schon einem *part. perf.* im Griechischen entspricht.' But is this possible? would not the writer, if he had intended to convey such an idea of past time, have written הִיא הִתְקַדְּשָׁה מִמ׳ וְהִיא שָׁכְבָה?

From § 160 it will be plain that the idiomatic equivalent of *καὶ ἐλιθοβόλουν τὸν Στέφανον ἐπικαλούμενον* is ו׳סקלו את־סמ׳ והוא קרא, not, as in the London translation, קרא alone: so Luke ii. 8 והם לנים, iv. 1 והוא מלא (after מן־הירדן), 35 לא חרע־לו מאומה (§ 163).

APPENDIX II.

On the Original Signification of the Jussive.

170. It cannot be denied or concealed that the use of the modal forms in Hebrew, particularly of the jussive, presents great difficulties to the grammarian. These difficulties would certainly in great measure vanish, if it could be legitimately supposed that the modal forms were destitute of any special significance, being assumed for 'euphony' or as 'poetical licences' etc., or (in the case of the cohortative *-ah*) being merely 'paragogic;' that, consequently, their presence might be disregarded, and the tenses translated, if need be, in the manner of mere imperfects. But the multitude of instances occurring in the Old Testament, in which the meaning of these forms is clear and unambiguous, forbids such a supposition,—at least unless we are prepared to shew that a particular author wrote incorrectly, or adopted some local style, or else that he lived during a period at which the forms in question had lost[1] their customary significance. We

[1] I observe that Olshausen, § 257 *a*, p. 571, makes the same suggestion: the forms in question, however, meet us in passages which present no other indication of a late date, and indeed give no ground for assuming it—even Ewald and Hitzig are content to assign Ps. xi,

are seldom, if ever, in a position which enables us to do this: the result is, that since the cases are far too numerous to favour the hypothesis of a corrupt text, modern grammarians are driven to the adoption of every kind of expedient in order to overcome the disagreement existing between the meaning apparently forced upon them by the form, and that which the context seems to demand.

171. Before proceeding further, however, it will be desirable to give a synopsis of the passages in which the difficulty is most seriously felt, including a few which, though they have been cited elsewhere[1], hardly seem in all respects to have received a final or satisfactory solution.

Gen. xxiv. 8 לֹא תָשֵׁב. Lev. xv. 24 וּתְהִי. Deut. xxxii. 18 תֵּשִׁי. 1 Kings ii. 6 לֹא תוֹרֵד, Is. xxvii. 5 יַחֲזִק־ אוֹ. xxxv. 4 יֹשַׁעֲכֶם. xlii. 6 וָאֲחַזֵּק. lviii. 10 וְתָפֵק. lxiii. 3 וַיַּז. Ezek. xiv. 7 וַיַּעַל. Hos. xi. 4 וָאֵמַּ? Joel ii. 20 וַתַּעַל. Mic. iii. 4 וַיַּסְתֵּר.

---

for example, to David. There are some traces, in the regular verb, of a parallel—perhaps an older—formation of the Hif'il with *ṣere* in the ultima instead of *chireq* (such are יעשֵׂרנו 1 Sam. xvii. 25, מוּצֵא Ps. cxxxv. 7, לעשֵׂר Deut. xxvi. 12, בהנחֵל xxxii. 8; see Kalisch, ii. p. 177): but, as Olshausen remarks, this circumstance will not explain the occurrence of the jussive form without (apparently) the jussive meaning in other verbs, as יהי: cf. likewise Ewald, § 131 *b*. And the same objection will hold against the suggestion that ימֵר may be falsely pointed for ימֵר etc.: although the Hif'il is unquestionably found several times thus written 'defectively' (as יעשֵׂר Ps. xlix. 17. Is. xliv. 28: further instances will be found in Kalisch, l. c.), forms like יהי, ירא, יגל, in all of which the mood is indicated by the *letters*, are too obstinate to admit of any such easy or rapid alteration.

[1] Cf. §§ 50 *a* (2nd paragraph), 58, 64 *Obs.*, 84 *β*, 121 *Obs.*, 155 *Obs.*: pp. 62[1], 106[1].

Zeph. ii. 13 וְיָשֵׁם . . . וְיֵט. Ps. xi. 6 יַמְטֵר. xii. 4 יַכְרֵת. xxv. 9 יַדְרֵךְ. xlvii. 4 יַדְבֵּר. lviii. 5 יֵאָטֵם. lxviii. 15 תַּשְׁלֵג. Prov. xv. 25 וְיַצֵּב. xxiii. 25 וְתָגֵל. Job ix. 33 יָשֶׂם. xiii. 27 וְתָשֵׂם. xv. 33 וַיַּשֵּׁל. xvii. 2 תָּלֹן . . . וְ. xviii. 9 יַחֲזִק, 12 יְהִי. xx. 23 וְיַמְטֵר . . . יְהִי, 26 יִרַע, 28 יָגֵל. xxiii. 9 וְלֹא אָחַז: 11 וְלֹא אָם. xxiv. 14 יְהִי . . . וְ, 25 וָשָׂם. xxvii. 8 כִּי יֵשֵׁל, 22 וַיַּשְׁלֵךְ. xxxiii. 11 יָשֵׂם, 21 יָכֹל, 27 יָשֹׁר. xxxiv. 37 וַיִּרֶב. xxxvi. 14 תָּמֹת, 15 וַיְגֵל. xxxviii. 24 יָפֵץ. xxxix. 26 יַאֲבֵר־נֵץ. xl. 19 יַגֵּשׁ. Lam. iii. 50 עַד יַשְׁקִיף וְיִרְאֶה. Qoh. xii. 7 וְיָשֹׁב (also after עד), and several times in Dan. xi. (*vv.* 4, 10, 16–19, 25, 28, 30).

Obs. The passages here put together are in many ways very dissimilar: each must be examined separately by itself, in close connection with its context, if the reader wishes to discover the real seat of the difficulty (if there be one), and to be able to judge of the comparative merits of the various solutions proposed. One such solution is that ·וַ is omitted, or replaced by וְ. This is adopted by Ewald, §§ 233 *a*, 343 *b*, and Dillmann (on Job xiii. 27. xxxiii. 21), and is extended by Hitzig (see his notes on Ps. viii. 7. xi. 6 etc.) so as to include even cases like Ps. lviii. 5 (for ויאטם, ·וַ being the continuation of the attributive חרש: cf. § 117, p. 151), and lxviii. 15 (·וַ following a time-determination, according to § 127 *β*). There are undoubtedly some places (see § 84) where we seem justified in assuming the omission of ·וַ, but it is very far-fetched and extravagant to have recourse to it for Ps. lviii and lxviii: in at least a few of the other passages, a jussive sense, as suggested § 58, appears not inappropriate; and the replacement of ·וַ by וְ seems not merely to involve the union of incongruous elements in the same word, but to depend upon a principle of which it is not easy to understand the action—for would not the rhetorical brilliancy acquired by dropping the ·וַ be considerably lessened if it were still retained as וְ, in spite of the modified form of the verb? There are other occasions also, as when the jussive appears after a particle like לא or כי, where the present explanation is obviously unsuitable. According to Delitzsch (on Ps. xi. 6), 'the shorter future form is often indicative, whether

applied to the future as lxxii. 13, or to the present as lviii. 5, or to the past as xviii. 12:' lxviii. 15 he treats as a hypothetical sentence, § 151; though it would be a unique case of an *infinitive* forming the protasis. On Prov. xv. 25 he writes, 'יִצֹּב is the shortened future form, which the loftier style, e. g. Deut. xxxii. 8, uses also as an indicative [and not as a jussive alone];' and on Job xiii. 27. xxiv. 14 he adopts a similar strain. On Ps. xli. 3, however, we find the remark, 'אל denies with sympathy' (compare the language of Ewald, § 320 *a*); and similarly on cxxi. 3 'das subjektive אל verneint mit affektuöser Abweisung des platterdings Unmöglichen,' and Prov. iii. 25, where the observation of Schultens is quoted, '*subest species prohibitionis et tamquam abominationis, ne tale quicquam vel in suspicionem veniat in mentemve cogitando admittatur.*' On the other hand, Böttcher, ii. p. 183, goes so far even as to state that the jussive may express 'das übel empfundene *muss* des fremden Eigenwillens Ij. xiii. 27. xxxiii. 11. xxiv. 14. xxxiv. 37:' how such a reversal of its ordinary meaning is possible, it is as difficult to comprehend as in the case of the cohortative, pp. 56–58. Let us see whether a more logical and satisfactory explanation cannot be found.

172. Allusion was briefly made in the text, p. 51, to the nature of the Greek optative: but a curious and singular parallel to some of the instances now under discussion, which is afforded by its use, remained unnoticed. In Greek an all but universal induction would seem to shew that when the optative mood was employed without ἄν (except, of course, in relative and dependent sentences), the expression of a *wish* was its inalienable function. Yet not in poetry merely, but in the strictest prose, a certain number of passages present themselves where we are forced to regard its meaning as practically equivalent to that which we should have thought ourselves justified in associating exclusively to those occasions when it occurred in conjunction with ἄν. Let us collect some of the passages in which this abnormal use appears:—Il. v. 303 ὃ οὐ δύο γ' ἄνδρε φέροιεν (observe the negative οὐ, not μὴ as

in a wish). x. 556. xv. 45, 197. xix. 321 *οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακώτερον ἄλλο πάθοιμι.* Od. iii. 231. xiv. 122 f. *οὔ τις . . . πείσειε* Pind. Ol. x. 19 *τὸ γὰρ ἐμφυὲς οὔτ' αἴθων ἀλώπηξ οὔτ' ἐρίβρομοι λέοντες διαλλάξαιντο ἦθος.* Soph. Ant. 604. Plato Gorg. 492 B *τί τῇ ἀληθείᾳ αἴσχιον καὶ κάκιον εἴη;* Euthyd. 298 E *πολὺ μέντοι δικαιότερον τὸν ὑμέτερον πατέρα τύπτοιμι.* Legg. 777 C[1]: in all these passages the ordinary Greek usage would, of course, have required the addition of *ἄν*. It will also be recollected that after *εἰ, ὅστις*, etc. (as Il. xxii. 73 *πάντα δὲ καλὰ θανόντι περ, ὅ,τττι φανείῃ.* Od. iii. 319 *ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅθεν οὐκ ἔλποιτό γε θυμῷ Ἑλθέμεν*), the 'optative' sense falls into abeyance as a matter of course: unlike the former, however, this is no exceptional case, but one of frequent occurrence.

On the other hand, it is well known that the optative *with* *ἄν* is not unfrequently used for the purpose of intimating a wish or a command, sometimes even with considerable sharpness and decision[2], as Il. ii. 250. Aesch. Ag. 1448 *φεῦ τις ἂν ἐν τάχει μόλοι.* Soph. El. 1491 *χωροῖς ἂν εἴσω.* Ant. 444 *σὺ μὲν κομίζοις ἂν σεαυτὸν ᾗ θέλεις,* '*you* may betake yourself where you like,' etc.

173. To enter into a more minute examination of the exact significance of each of these usages would be beside our present purpose: a few remarks, however, suggest themselves which will perhaps throw some light on the question which immediately interests us.

---

[1] Compare further Jelf, § 426; Riddell, *Apology of Plato*, p. 142; Hermann, *Opuscula*, iv. pp. 154–164; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* *ἄν*, x. 1. *c*: even though with Madvig, *Advers. Critica* (see Index, i. p. 736), such of the instances as occur in prose were to be corrected by adding *ἄν*, the rest would be scarcely amenable to the same treatment.

[2] Jelf, §§ 425. 1 *b*, 427. 3.

The optative is the mood denoting *indefinite possibility:* its meaning therefore corresponds to that of the English auxiliary *might*—μόλοι, 'he *might* come.' Now if the tone or general attitude of the speaker be favourable, 'he *might* come' may indicate an event which he is desirous, or at any rate not unwilling, to see realised; this the very terms he makes use of plainly declare. At the same time, in a different context, the optative may remain purely potential. The former became the predominant signification of the bare optative: the latter sense was in general more distinctly marked by the addition of ἄν, the particle indicating the presence of contingency[1].

But in neither case did the stated result *universally* and *exclusively* follow: the 'might' of the 'optative' (in its etymological sense) reverted, though but rarely, into the *might* of mere possibility, while the 'might' of the optative with ἄν, undergoing an analogous transition to that which the *original* 'might' had experienced before, became intensified into the *might* expressive of an injunction or a command.

Thus we have (1) μόλοι, originally='he might come,' usually strengthened into 'might he come!' but occasionally lapsing into 'he might come.'

(2) μόλοι ἄν, specially and pointedly 'he might come,' but occasionally strengthened into a weak 'might he come!'

174. Now let us examine the bearing of what has been here said upon some of the peculiarities presented by the Hebrew jussive. The theory that the shortened

---

[1] Both senses obviously co-exist in the Latin *veniat:* and compare how *ich möchte wohl wissen* means *I should like to know.*

form was generated by an accelerated pronunciation fails upon more grounds than one. In the first place, it is unnecessary to state that there is an absolute lack of the slightest positive evidence in favour of such a hypothesis: the sole ground upon which it rests is an *assumed fitness* or natural correspondence between a particular form of expression and the mental state out of which it sometimes springs. I say *sometimes*, for the jussive quite as frequently expresses a prayer or entreaty as a command: and no one will suppose that for the first of these functions the attitude and the feelings, of which the shortened form of the jussive is said to be the exponent, are in the least appropriate. Nor am I aware of any data which would meet this objection by making it probable that the mood in question was at first applied wholly in the stronger and more emphatic sense, and that it was only at a later period that it assumed an optative or precative signification. In the second place, the hypothesis does not cover the facts to be explained; so long as we *begin* with the idea of either a jussive or an optative, a number of passages remain permanently and obstinately inexplicable. And in the third place, even if it were contended that these facts were exceptional (although the capability of a hypothesis to include and account for such outlying residuary phenomena is one of the most conclusive tests of its validity), there are in Arabic, not exceptional or isolated constructions, but facts of regular and constant occurrence, which seem to me utterly irreconcilable with the view that the jussive was used originally in the sense alleged. I allude, firstly, to the manner in which the jussive appears in conditional propositions, and particularly in the protasis. In Arabic

we continually meet with sentences like the following, 'If good befalleth you, it grieveth them; and if ill lighteth upon you, they rejoice at it,' 'if they were to see all kinds of signs, they would not believe in them,' 'if he wills, he could make you pass away,' 'whether you conceal what is in your breast, or disclose it, God will know it,' 'wherever you may be, death will overtake you[1],' in which *all* the verbs are regularly jussives. Now it is easily intelligible in what way a jussive form might be used to state or assume a case, and thus occupy the place of a formal protasis introduced by 'if:' indeed this clearly resembles what actually takes place in English, and would be in complete analogy with that use of the jussive itself in Hebrew, and of the imperative in both Hebrew and Arabic, which was explained and illustrated in the text, §§ 151, 152. Here, however, the jussive stands alone, and retains its strictly jussive sense. But in the constructions referred to, it does *not* stand alone: it is, on the contrary, preceded by a particle, and this particle *excludes* a jussive sense. A protasis may be expressed in one of two ways; you may say either '*Let him ask, and he will receive*,' or '*If he asks, he will receive*:' but the two are mutually exclusive, and cannot be combined. If you use the former, then 'if' is redundant: if you use the latter, then the jussive signification is out of place. In the one, the jussive will not tolerate the 'if:' in the other, the 'if' destroys both the need and the significance of the jussive.

The other idiom alluded to is the use of the jussive after the indefinite مَنْ *man*, 'whoso,' as 'whoso *believes* (juss.)

[1] Qor'an iii. 116. vi. 25, 133. xiv. 22. iii. 27. iv. 80: add iii. 68, 95, 121, 142. vi. 69, 116. vii. 128, 143, 175, 192, 197. xi. 49. xl. 12, 29. xlii. 23 etc.; and see Wright, ii. §§ 13, 17; Ewald, § 750.

in God, he *will forgive* him' (juss.), 'whoso *desireth* anything other than 'Islam as a religion, it will not be accepted of him,' 'whom God *wills*, he *misleadeth*[1].' It is manifest that the remarks just made apply here with even greater cogency, if possible, than before: under all such circumstances, the 'jussive' meaning becomes simply unintelligible.

175. There are, then, formidable difficulties in the way of accepting the usual theory of the origin of the jussive. But all the difficulties in Arabic, and most of those in Hebrew, at once disappear if we change our starting-point, and instead of beginning with the idea of a command, assume rather that the jussive was at first a special modification designed to emphasize the idea of potentiality or contingency, which we know to belong to the imperfect. The mind, in fact, finds itself unable to form any clear or rational conception of the weakening and generalizing, or rather, to call it by its proper name, of the *pulverizing* process, which, if the former hypothesis be true, the jussive must have undergone before it could become adapted to occupy a position after such words as *if* or *whoever*: on the other hand, we do not experience the slightest difficulty in understanding and realising a movement in the opposite direction, such as is demanded by the theory here advocated—a movement which indeed we can watch taking place under our own eyes in the

[1] Qor. iii. 79. vi. 39. lx. 9: add further iii. 17, 27, 138, 139, 155. vi. 125. vii. 177, 185. xi. 20. xlii. 22 etc.; and similarly after مَا *what*, ii. 274. iii. 111: in some of these passages the jussive stands only in the protasis. The indicative mood of the imperfect, however, as well as the jussive, is sometimes met with after مَنْ, as iii. 25, 32, 66, 124. vi. 25, 88 al.

case of the optative with ἄν. Once accept the new basis of arrangement, and what was before confused and fragmentary becomes forthwith orderly and coherent. The Arabic constructions fall immediately into their right places: they no longer present anything awkward or inexplicable. The hypotheticals are formed in accordance with a type well known to us from the familiar construction of the double optative in Greek—the jussive, on the one hand, in both protasis and apodosis, answering to the optative on the other, and neither being used in its etymological sense. And the appearance of the jussive after the indefinite 'whoso' is as intelligible as that of the optative after ὅστις and similar words—for example, in the line Od. i. 47 quoted below.

176. And now the anomalous passages in Hebrew, which perplexed us so much while we started with the idea of a *wish*, cease to do so any longer: in some the jussive stands naturally after a relative, in others the phenomena presented are in close correspondence with those noticed in § 172. For, if this view be correct, the title jussive, like optative in Greek, will correspond to a secondary and adventitious, not a primary and original characteristic of the form: the *may* or *might* which it strictly expresses will have been most commonly interpreted in the sense of a permission, command, or wish, while upon a few rare occasions its earlier meaning will have been preserved. The jussive יאמם in a relative sentence, Ps. lviii. 5. Ezek. xiv. 7, is at once seen to be the exact equivalent to the optative similarly placed, e. g. Od. i. 47 ὃς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι. Soph. Ant. 666, Meno 92 C etc.: כי יִשָּׁל Job xxvii. 8 (unless with Lagarde we emend יִשָּׁאֵל.) will be the counterpart of

ὅτ' ἀγγελίη ποθὲν ἔλθοι Od. xiv. 374; xxiv. 25. xxxix. 26 (in a question) will be like Soph. Ant. 604 τεὰν Ζεῦ δύνασιν τίς ἀνδρῶν ὑπερβασία κατάσχοι; while Is. xxxv. 4 וישעכם *and can save you* (cf. Job xxiv. 14. xl. 19) will in form as well as meaning resemble Od. iii. 231 ῥεῖα θεός γ' ἐθέλων καὶ τηλόθεν ἄνδρα σαώσαι. And the modal force perceptible in such passages as Prov. xv. 25. Job xv. 33. xxiv. 14. xxvii. 22. xxxvi. 15 will really be fairly reproduced by *may, might, can*, as Od. xiv. 122. xvi. 386. Il. x. 556 f. xv. 197. The jussive after לא (not אל) in the two passages, Gen. xxiv. 8. 1 Kings ii. 6, will convey a recommendation or suggestion rather than a distinct injunction —οὐκ ἂν καταγάγοις rather than μὴ καταγάγῃς or οὐ κατάξεις. Now likewise the propriety of the same mood in dependent sentences, as well in the cases already cited (§§ 63, 64), as after עד Lam. iii. 50. Qoh. xii. 7, becomes self-evident.

Obs. 1. Several of the passages quoted, § 171, remain, however, still unaccounted for. Ps. xi. 6. xii. 4. xxv. 9. xlvii. 4. Job xviii. 9, 12. xx. 23, 26, 28, should the supposition suggested in § 58 be thought improbable or extreme, must be explained either in the same indefinite sense ('*will be* subduing'—less decided and categorical than the full future), or by means of § 84. Lev. xxvi. 43. Job ix. 33. Dan. viii. 12 belong certainly to §§ 62–64, and probably likewise Lev. xv. 24. Is. xlii. 6. lxiii. 3 ('*so that* it might sprinkle,' with a change of construction in the following *perfect*, exactly as Job xxxiii. 21: cf. p. 18). Mic. iii. 4. Job xiii. 27. xvii. 2. xxiii. 9, 11. xxxiii. 11, 21. xxxiv. 37 ('*in order to* multiply his sayings against God'—an aggravation of ביניבו יספוק). xxxvi. 14. Possibly, however, in xxiii. 9, 11 we may be at liberty to hold that the form usual with ו has been irregularly retained, even after separation from the conjunction. In Zeph. ii. 13. Prov. xxiii. 25 the verbs seem to be strictly jussive: Is. lviii. 10 the jussive is perhaps resolvable by *if*, being followed exceptionally by a perfect with waw, in lieu of a second jussive (p. 199). Is. xxvii. 5

receives light from an Arabic idiom[1], '*or else let* him take hold' etc. = '*unless* he take hold' (Germ. 'es *sei* denn dass man meinen schuz ergriffe'). In Dan. xi, unless the reader thinks he can still trace the notion of a consequence or result, we may be content to suppose that the mood was used without any recollection of its distinctive signification. It is strange that Dr. Pusey (*Daniel*, p. 587) should accept Ewald's classification, § 343 *c*, as decisive or satisfactory. A distinction ought surely to be made between such cases as Is. xix. 20, where the verb after ו is the simple imperfect, and those like Joel ii. 20, where it is jussive: the former present no difficulty (see § 134), it is the latter which embarrass us. Dr. Pusey says, 'the condensation of this idiom, the use of the apocopated form, with the simple *and*, shews there is great emphasis in it:' but by what conceivable process can a wish or command, such as we know to be signified by the apocopated imperfect, be transformed into a mere expression of emphasis? Certainly the jussive, like the imperative, is sometimes employed in a rhetorical style with brilliancy and effect; but then, as we saw §§ 56–58, it retains its rightful force, and, in fact, would not be effective unless it did retain it: in the instances alleged, on the contrary, its proper meaning is taken from it, and a *different* meaning, incompatible with, and *not derivable from*, the meaning borne elsewhere, is substituted in its place. Such substitution does not appear defensible: for Dan. xi therefore, which, whatever its date, certainly does not exhibit the freshness and power of the poet which are so conspicuous in the elder prophets, it will be preferable to acquiesce in the solution proposed above—a solution which has at least the advantage of being in agreement with a known principle of language. But for Joel ii. 20, as also for Deut. xxxii. 18 (which was prematurely quoted § 27 *a*), Hos. xi. 4 (supposing נס to be a verb), Ps. lxviii. 15, no plausible suggestion seems to offer itself: we are almost driven therefore to have recourse to the hypothesis of a corrupt text. As regards the vowel-points, at any rate, although in general not much improvement is effected by deserting the Masoretic vocalization, yet we must remember that the tradition

[1] Where, however, the *subjunctive* mood is employed (cf. for a similar variation, p. 71): Ewald, § 629; Wright, ii. § 15 (6), 'I will certainly kill the unbeliever أَوْ يُسْلِمَ *unless* he become a Muslim.'

of which it is the embodiment *may* have become vitiated during the period of oral transmission prior to the time when it was fixed in a written record; this might have happened from various causes, such as false analogy or a misconception—e. g. even in Is. lxiii. 3 it is possible that וַיַּז may be a mispunctuation for וַיַּז, originating in the two preceding verbs being wrongly interpreted as futures, instead of frequentatives. If, therefore, adherence to the Masoretic text threatens to bid defiance to the most certain results of grammatical enquiry, we must, however reluctantly, consent to abandon it. And assuredly, if anywhere, it is in a case like the present that such a course will be admitted to be free from the charge of haste or uncritical rashness.

Obs. 2. Westphal (*Vergl. Gr.*, 1873, p. 428) says indeed, 'Der Grundbegriff des Optativ ist der Wunsch,' but is not successful in the attempt to deduce from this idea the meanings actually borne by the mood. Nöldeke (*Gött. Gel. Anzeigen*, 1868, p. 1141) would explain the Arabic constructions in a different way: he supposes that the apocopated form after *'in* or *man* etc. is to be attributed to the same cause which most probably produced it after *lam* (above, p. 87), and that then the verb in the apodosis assumed the same form *aus dem Streben nach Congruenz zwischen den beiden Hälften der Periode.* The theory is ingenious, and has certainly the merit of recognising the existence of a difficulty. But it is scarcely convincing: the 'desire for uniformity' seems a questionable means of accounting for the jussive in the apodosis, and the analogy of the corresponding use of the optative in Greek (to which Nöldeke's theory is of course inapplicable) seems to justify us in seeking for some principle of language in which both idioms may have originated alike.

On the use of the jussive and the functions which it fulfils in Hebrew, a discussion, which will quite repay perusal, may be found in J. G. Stickel, *das Buch Hiob* (1842), pp. 181–186.

APPENDIX III.

On Arabic as Illustrative of Hebrew.

177. In few departments of knowledge has the 'comparative' method of enquiry been more fruitful of valuable and interesting results than in the investigation of the phenomena presented by language. What that method is, and, at least in so far as regards the Aryan languages, what some of the more important of the results alluded to are, will be familiar to most English readers from the well-known volumes of Professor Max Müller, in which the principles of Comparative Philology are at once lucidly set forth and abundantly illustrated. A general acquaintance may, therefore, be presupposed with the character, for example, of the cumulative evidence by which the direct or collateral genealogical relationship, subsisting between the languages belonging to a given family, may be established, with the nature of the successive modifications a language may undergo, with the laws which regulate the particular and distinctive form assumed in each by the same word, and with the mutual illustration which languages thus allied afford of one another.

178. The same method is, however, no less applicable to the Semitic family of speech than to the Aryan. A merely superficial comparison of the vocabulary and accidence—to say nothing of the syntax—is sufficient

to reveal the fact that all the Semitic languages are intimately connected with one another, and that the nations speaking them must, at some period or other, have dwelt together in a common home: more accurate and systematic research shews that none of them can lay claim to *exclusive* priority above the rest, as being the one from which the others are derived (in the same manner, for instance, as the Romance languages are derived from Latin), but that they are the descendants of a deceased mother, whose most prominent characteristics, though with different degrees of clearness and purity, they all still reflect. Each after its separation from the parent stock pursued a path of its own, some, as it would seem, through long years preserving almost intact many of the features they originally possessed; others, on the contrary, lopping these off, or else assimilating them, with greater or less rapidity. It is just in virtue of this *uneven development* of language, just in virtue of the fact that what is mutilated and obscured in one language is frequently in another language of the same family retained in a relatively unimpaired condition, and transmitted so into historical times, that the explanation of one by the other is still possible, even when the relationship lies no longer in a direct line.

179. Although our immediate object is but a narrow one, being the illustration, not of the Hebrew language as a whole, but only of the verb (under certain aspects) by Arabic, yet in order to accomplish this satisfactorily, it will be desirable to make our way sure by defining more closely the relation in which these two languages stand towards each other. If Arabic were altogether a *younger* language than Hebrew, i. e. if it represented

a more recent stratification, an ulterior stage beyond that at which Hebrew had arrived, it would be chimerical to expect it to throw much light upon the latter: we do not, as a rule, look to French or Italian to elucidate Latin, and we should not, in the case assumed, look to Arabic to elucidate Hebrew. If, however, notwithstanding the difference of date, Arabic exhibits particular formations in a more original condition than Hebrew, then such a course would be the natural one to adopt, and our expectations would not be disappointed. And this is, in fact, the case. Arabic is, in many respects, *an older language than Hebrew:* speaking roughly and without intending the analogy to be pressed in detail, we may say that Hebrew bears the same sort of relation to Arabic that English does to German. Consider in what manner German often lights up an obscure corner in English: I do not, of course, mean to imply that it presents us with the constituent factors of our own language in their ultimate and original form, but it reduces our irregularities to rule, it exhibits what with us is fragmentary, residuary, or imperfect, as parts of a complete and systematic whole. Various rare or antiquated forms, provincialisms, the peculiarities connected with the use of the auxiliaries, may be taken as examples. What is the meaning of *worth* in the line, 'Woe worth the day, woe worth the hour!' It is plain that it cannot be used in its ordinary acceptation as a substantive or an adjective: but our own language offers us nothing with which it can be connected or identified. In English the word is, in fact, the only survivor of a once numerous family: separated from its kindred, its meaning, and even what part of speech it is, has become totally forgotten. But in German the whole

family still exists in the shape of a verb, complete in all its parts, and forming now an integral and indispensable element in the language. Thus the irregularity ceases to be irregular: the fragment at once falls into its proper place, as a part in a living whole, and as such reassumes the signification which had well nigh been irrecoverably lost[1]. And, similarly, it is often possible in Arabic to trace the entire stratification of which Hebrew has preserved nothing more than a few remains scattered here and there, which, *taken by themselves*, can never be adequately explained.

180. The assertion, however, that Arabic is an older language than Hebrew will excite the reader's surprise, if not his derision. It will appear to him, in the literal sense of the word, preposterous, thus to invert the natural order of things: he will deem it incredible that a language so ancient as Hebrew unquestionably is, should yield in originality to one which does not enter the field of history for some 1500–2000 years after a period when that which is now declared to be the younger and less primitive is known from authentic records to have flourished. And yet, we may ask, is such an opinion so incredible or improbable as it may at first sight appear? If, for instance, as competent and independent authorities affirm[2], there are parts of Arabia in which the language of the Qor'an may be heard in unaltered purity at the present day, if, therefore, the Arabic language has remained unchanged during the last 1200 years, may it not have continued

[1] Earle, *Philology of the English Tongue*, § 283.

[2] Freytag, quoted by Dr. Pusey, *Daniel*, p. 36; Palgrave, *Travels in Central Arabia* (1866), i. p. 311; also Philippi, *Wesen und Ursprung des St. Constr.*, p. 124.

in the same manner comparatively unchanged during an indefinite period previously? Were not the tranquil and secluded habits of the Arab tribes (whose motto might well have been the words להם לבדם נתנה הארץ ולא עבר זר בתוכם) eminently calculated to preserve the integrity of their language, while the migratory and unsettled life of the early Hebrews, to say nothing of their depression and subjugation בארץ לא להם, the effects of which cannot but have been strongly impressed upon their language, would tend in just the opposite direction? May not Hebrew then, so to speak, be a language which is *prematurely old*, while Arabic, under the influence of favourable external conditions, retained till a much later date the vigour and luxuriance of its youth?

Obs. It may also be recollected that there are other instances in which, of two languages belonging to the same family, the one which historically is known only as the later, may nevertheless contain many elements more primitive than any to be found in the other. For example, compare Latin with Greek. Greek appears as a fully developed language long before the date of the earliest records written in Latin (inscriptions of about 250 B.C.): yet comparative philology teaches us that Latin is in more respects than one an *older* language than Greek—it retains the older forms, which in Greek have gradually given way, and receded from sight. Thus the digamma (*F*), which the metre proves to have existed at the time when the Homeric poems were composed, before long vanished from the language: in Latin the corresponding sound (*v*) was retained to the end (*vinum*, *vicus*, *video*, etc.). Similarly, where in Greek we have only the aspirate, Latin retains the earlier sibilant: cf. ἕ, ἕξ, ἕπτα, ὅλος, ἵστημι with *se*, *sex*, *septem*, *salvus*, *sisto*. Numerous instances may also be found in the case- and person-endings. In Greek *σ* was regularly dropped between two vowels, in Latin it was retained, at least under another form: accordingly in generis, musarum, we hear the representative of the *σ* which had already disappeared even in the oldest Greek forms, γένεος (for *γενε-σ-ος)

and *μουσάων*. Passing to the verb, we have here *sum* by the side of *εἰμὶ* (for **ἐσμί*, Sk. *ásmi*), *es* by the side of *εἶ* (i. e. **ἐσί*, cf. *ἐσσί*, Sk. *ási*), *eram* by the side of *ἦν*, in Homer *ἔην* (i. e. **ἔσην*), *siem* (for es-iem) by the side of *εἴην* (i. e. **ἐσίην*): in *legit* the *t* is preserved which has vanished from *λέγει* (for **λέγετι*), though it reappears in *λέγεται*, and in verbs in *-μι* takes the form of *σ*: *legimus* and *legunt*, like the dialectic *λέγομες*, *λέγοντι*, are older than *λέγομεν*, *λέγουσι* (for *λέγονσι*, i. e. *λέγοντι*), and *legentem*, like *matrem* and *decem*, is older than *λέγοντα*, *μητέρα*, and *δέκα* (Sk. *mātáram*, *daśan*). These examples, shewing as they do that numerous forms still existed in Latin centuries after they had been lost or materially modified in Greek, will, I hope, be sufficient to diminish, if not to destroy, any doubt of the *possibility* of similar phenomena being observable in Arabic, as compared with Hebrew, in spite of the disparity of date.

181. But we are not confined to probable reasoning: the presence of the older form in Arabic admits frequently of direct demonstration. Let us take two or three of the more obvious cases. In Hebrew the consonant following the article is regularly doubled: we may indeed surmise from analogy that the duplication conceals some letter which once formed part of the article; but what that letter may have been, the Hebrew language itself does not afford the materials even for a plausible conjecture. In Arabic the hidden letter is obvious. There the article is *'al*, in which the *l* is *never* assimilated in writing with the following consonant, and not in pronunciation except when the latter is a sibilant, dental, or liquid. Thus *'almalku*=הַמֶּלֶךְ: *'ashshamsu*=הַשָּׁמֶשׁ. Now it is inconceivable that *'almalku* can have arisen out of *hammélekh* by disintegration: Hebrew itself tells us that נָתַתָּ, מִדַּבֵּר, מִצָּפוֹן are posterior to נתנת, מתדבר, מן־צפון: it is accordingly evident that Arabic has preserved the older unassimilated form which in Hebrew regularly suffered

assimilation[1]. Exactly the same relation between the two languages is observable in *'anta*, *'antum* by the side of אַתָּה, אַתֶּם. Again in ־הָ several originally distinct terminations have become merged: this can be shewn inferentially from Hebrew itself, but in Arabic these terminations are still distinguishable. In all feminine nouns such as מְדִינָה, the *h* represents an original *th*, dropped in ordinary pronunciation, but reappearing[2] in *st. constr.* and before a suffix מְדִינַת, מְדִינָתִי: in Arabic the *t* is written regularly, *medînatun*, city (where *n* is the so-called 'nunation,' and *u* marks the nominative case). Similarly כְּתֻבָה was once כְּתֻבַת, as we see from the form assumed before a suffix גְּנֻבָתַם (cf. also the sporadic forms אֲזֻלַת, חֲרֻצַת, עֲשֻׂקַת, etc.): accordingly in Arabic we have regularly, as 3 *fem.*, *katabat*. In verbs ל״ה, the ה stands for an older י or ו, which must indeed be presupposed for such forms as גָּלוּי, חָסִיה, יִרְבִּיוּן, אֵתִיו, and the derivatives רָאוּי, נִקְיוֹן: in Arabic the weak consonant is often visible to the eye (though quiescent when the vowel immediately preceding it is *a*), as رَأَى *ra'a'* = ראה, أَتَى *'ata'* = אתה, رَعَى *ra'a'* = רעה, نَقِيَ *naqiya* = נקה.

At the commencement of a word Hebrew evinces a strong dislike to the presence of ו, a letter for which Arabic has almost as marked a preference: thus for ילד,

---

[1] The existence at an early period of the article *'al* seems to be incidentally attested by the name אלמודד Gen. x. 26: cf. Ewald, *Ueber die geschichtliche Folge der Sem. Sprachen* (Göttingen 1871), p. 60: also Kalisch, ii. xxi. 1 (*b*).

[2] So in French the *t* of *habet*, *amat*, lost in *il a*, *il aime*, becomes visible again in *a-t-il? aime-t-il?* Ἔδειξα is in Sk. *adiksham*, and the liquid with which the Greek word must once have terminated is seen in the middle ἐδείκα-μ-ην.

ישע, ירש, we find *walada*, *wasi'a*, *waritha*; in which of the two languages now has the change taken place? Hebrew itself will answer this question. By the side of יָלַד we find הוֹלִיד, נוֹלַד, יִוָּלֵד (cf. הִתְוַדֵּע), where it is impossible to account for the ו except by supposing it to have been the original letter which in ילד was modified into י owing to a peculiarity of Hebrew pronunciation: the opposite assumption cannot be made, because no assignable reason exists for an original י to be changed into ו so soon as it ceases to begin a word. More than this, the Arabic *'awlada* shews us the uncontracted form of הוֹלִיד: as in *'aw*, *qawlun*, *maw'idun* (مَوْعِدٌ), for אוֹ, קוֹל, מוֹעֵד etc., the waw retains its consonantal value, and *aw* (which is obviously the earlier form) has not yet become *ô*.

182. Having thus by a variety of instances, all pointing irresistibly in the same direction, established our right to treat Arabic forms as more primitive than the corresponding forms in Hebrew, we may go further, and adopt unhesitatingly the same opinion in cases which might seem inconclusive if considered by themselves, but which, in the light of those instances, will not admit of explanation by any different hypothesis. It is a characteristic of languages which occupy towards one another the relation here shewn to subsist between Arabic and Hebrew, that isolated or sporadic forms in the one correspond to forms of regular occurrence in the other. Now for אַתְּ, לָךְ, קָטַלְתְּ, we find occasionally a K'tib אתי, לכי, קטלתי (2 Kings iv. 2, 7, 16, 23. Ruth iii. 3, 4 al.), and in Arabic this *yod* is the regular mark of the 2nd *fem. sing.*, as *'anti*, *laki* (Qor. iii. 32), *qatalti*: accordingly it is plain that *i* was the original vowel (cf. also תקטלי), which in Hebrew, gradu-

ally becoming inaudible, was ultimately omitted in writing, except in the cases alluded to, and before a suffix where like the *th*, § 181, it naturally reappears (קִטַּלְתִּינִי)[1]. In the same way, there can be hardly any doubt that the rare terminations ־וֹ, ־ִי, sometimes affixed to words in *st. constr.* (Kalisch, ii. § xxvi; Gesenius, § 90), are relics of ancient case-endings[2]—petrified survivals, meaningless in Hebrew, full of meaning in Arabic and in the primitive language from which Arabic and Hebrew are both equally sprung. The case is similar with ־ָה, which, as a movable suffix, was still felt to retain a definite import, but in certain by-forms as נַחֲלָה, לַיְלָה, חַרְסָה (which cannot be simply *feminines*, if only on account of the tone) is a perpetuation of the old accusative-ending *-an*, though with loss of its particular signification[3]. And this leads us to the subject which imme-

---

[1] In Syriac the *yod* is written, but not pronounced: ܠܝܠܝ, ܟܬܒ, ܡܟܬܒ. Syriac likewise sides with Arabic in some of the other points enumerated: cf. ܠܝܐ, ܠܝܐܝ, ܡܟܬ (3 *fem.*), ܠܝܠ, ܡܟܬܒ, ܡܟܬܒܐ. In ܗܘܐ, Chald. הֲוָא (= Heb. היה), we see the older ו, which is also retained in the name יהוה.

[2] But see Ewald in the Göttingen *Nachrichten*, 1871, p. 303.

[3] This will not surprise us any more than the manner in which, after the declensions, as such, were given up in the Romance languages, the noun still continued to be designated by a form derived not from the Latin nominative, but from the *accusative:* thus in French we have *rien, raison, murs, maux*, from *rem, rationem, muros, malos; le, les, mon, mes*, from *illum, illos, meum, meos*, etc. Respecting this selection of the accusative, see further Brachet's *Historical French Grammar* (Mr. Kitchin's translation), pp. 88–96, where it is likewise shewn how, in isolated instances, as in *fils*, the nominative was preserved: in French, then, by a strange reversal of what might have been anticipated, the nominative was the excep-

diately concerns us. Exactly as בַּיְתָה corresponds to بَيْتًا *baytan*, so אֶקְטֹלָה corresponds to the Arabic 'energetic' أَقْتُلَنْ (also أَقْتُلَنَّ) *'aqtulan* (*'aqtulanna*).

183. To the reader who is unacquainted with Arabic, the force of this comparison will be rendered more palpable if it be explained that in that language the imperfect tense possesses four distinct modal forms, each marked by its own termination, viz. the indicative, the subjunctive, the jussive, and the energetic. Thus from *qatala* (=קָטַל) we get—

	INDIC.	SUBJ.	JUSSIVE.	ENERGETIC.
1 sing.	*'aqtulu*	*'aqtula*	*'aqtul*	*'aqtulan* (or *-anna*).
3 pl. masc.	*yaqtulúna*	*yaqtulú*	*yaqtulú*	*yaqtulun* (or *-unna*).

In *yaqtulúna* the source of the *n* in יִקְטְלוּן immediately discloses itself: like the modern Arabic, ordinary Hebrew discarded the final syllable *-na;* occasionally[1], however,

tional form; in Hebrew, on the other hand, this peculiarity fell to the share of the accusative as well. 'In modern Arabic the oblique form of the plural (*-în*) has everywhere superseded the direct form (*-ûn*),' Wright, § 347, rem. *b*: cf. Philippi, *St. Constr.*, pp. 143 ff.

In classical Arabic the noun is declined as follows:—

	SINGULAR.	DUAL.	PLURAL.
N.	*kâtibun* = (כֹּתֵב)	*kâtibâni*	*kâtibúna.*
G. D.	*kâtibin*	*kâtibaini*	*kâtibína.*
A.	*kâtiban*		

The coincidence of the Hebrew dual and plural with the *oblique* cases in Arabic is certainly remarkable, and cannot be purely accidental.

[1] Detailed and interesting particulars respecting its occurrence may be found in Böttcher, § 930.

the longer form makes its appearance as an archaism, which Arabic enables us to trace to its origin. With the subjunctive we are not here further concerned: but the two remaining moods have both left in Hebrew indelible marks of their presence, in a manner which declares that they must once have been more uniformly and extensively recognisable than is now the case: marks which it is the more important to observe, since, *as the usage of the language shews*, they still retained a distinctive meaning. As regards the jussive, nothing need be added to what has been already said (pp. 49, 195, 224). With respect to the energetic, which, like the jussive, is used indiscriminately with *all* the persons, a reference to the examples given below, p. 247, will shew that its use is by no means limited to the expression of a strongly-felt purpose or desire, but that it is employed much more widely, to convey, for instance, an emphatic command, or to add a general emphasis to the assertion of a future fact—it being a matter of indifference whether this fact is *desired* by the speaker or not: and the reader will not unnaturally wonder why, when its signification is so broad and comprehensive in Arabic, any difficulty should be felt in conceding a similar scope to the Hebrew cohortative. *A priori*, to be sure, the cohortative, so far as can be seen, might have been employed with the same range of meaning as the energetic: it is only actual examination which, fixing narrower limits for the vast majority of passages in which it occurs, forbids us to exceed them for the two or three isolated occasions upon which its predominant sense seems out of place.

Obs. In many—perhaps most—of the cases where Arabic makes use of the energetic, Hebrew would, in fact, avail itself of a totally

different construction, viz. the *infinitive absolute* prefixed to the verb —a construction which imparts similar emphasis to the sentiment expressed, and of which it is almost impossible not to be spontaneously reminded, as one contemplates the Arabic energetic. Not only do the two idioms agree in other respects, but, singularly enough, the infinitive absolute is frequently found after אם or כי (e.g. Ex. xv. 26. xix. 5. Lev. xiv. 48. Judg. xvi. 11. Jer. xxxviii. 17 al.), precisely as the energetic occurs after إمّا. Will it, then, be thought too bold to conjecture that the wider and more general functions which this form continued to exercise in Arabic, were in Hebrew superseded by the rise of a new idiom, of genuine native growth, which gradually absorbed all except one? that in this way the termination *-an* or *-anna*, from having been once capable of a more varied application, came ultimately to be definitely restricted to the single function with which we are so familiar? Both idioms subserving upon the whole the same objects, after the inf. abs. had established itself in the language, they would speedily come into collision; it would be felt that the two were not needed together, and by a division of labour the language would gain in both definiteness and force. A bold and original idiom would be at hand to give vigorous expression to an emphasized assertion, while, at the same time, a clear and unambiguous formula would be secured for the intimation of an intention or desire.

184. The reader ought, however, to be aware that quite a different conception of the relationship subsisting between Hebrew and Arabic has both been advocated, and received the approbation of scholars. Thus, M. Renan writes—and his words are echoed by 'T. J. O.' in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. *Shemitic Languages and Writing*, § 32—'l'hébreu ancien possède en germe presque tous les procédés, qui font la richesse de l'arabe,' and 'le mécanisme du *futur figuré*, qui offre en arabe tant de richesse et de variété, et supplée presque à l'absence des modes, se retrouve à l'état rudimentaire dans les futurs apocopés et paragogiques de

l'hébreu[1].' In support of these assertions, M. Renan appeals to Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude*, p. vii, where the remark occurs that 'a number of forms and constructions, which in the rich Arabic grammar are developed and predominant, present themselves in Hebrew only in weak and undeveloped beginnings, as, in particular, is the case with the "figured" future [i. e. the modal forms].' Not only, however, does this remark seem irreconcilable with the facts adduced in § 181, but it is directly contradicted by another statement of Gesenius on the same page, where, comparing the *popular* with the *literary* Arabic, he observes that the former 'often approximates more closely to Hebrew, in that many forms existing in the written language have in the popular language *dropped out of use*[2], and, so to speak, perished, e. g. the numerous modifications of the future, many conjugations, forms of nouns, etc.'—language which certainly implies that they have likewise dropped out of use in Hebrew[3]. It need only be further added that, in accepting the latter view as better supported by the evidence, there are, of course, two errors to be guarded against: one, that of imagining Hebrew to be *derived from* Arabic; the other,

---

[1] *Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques*, pp. 424, 425 (ed. 1863). Cf. Bleek, *Introd. to the Old Test.*, § 34; Keil, *Introd. to the Old Test.*, § 13.

[2] For some illustrations of this, see Wright, *Arab. Gramm.*, pp. 55 f., 100–102, 194 f.; Philippi, p. 145.

[3] Compare his smaller Grammar (edited by Roediger), § 1. 6 with the *Obs.*: 'The Arabic retained longest the natural fulness and primitive purity of its sounds and forms' etc. § 90. 1: 'These endings remain only as crumbled remains of a fuller and more vital organic development.'

that of concluding *everything* exhibited by the classical Arabic to have originated in primitive Semitic times. The true state of the case is rather this: Hebrew and Arabic, with the other Semitic languages, are the *collateral* descendants of the old Semitic stock, of which Arabic is thought upon the whole to have preserved the greatest resemblance to the parent tongue: but this by no means excludes the possibility of Arabic itself, after its separation from the other languages, developing particular forms and constructions, which would, of course, be peculiar to itself alone[1].

---

[1] On p. 423 M. Renan writes, 'L'arabe . . . n'est pas, comme l'ont cru plusieurs philologues, le *sanscrit* des langues sémitiques: *ce titre de langue primitive et parfaite appartient à l'hébreu.*' The last remark involves four direct propositions: 1. that Sanskrit is a primitive language; 2. that Sanskrit is a perfect language; 3. that Hebrew is a primitive language; 4. that Hebrew is a perfect language; besides two others by implication, viz. 5. that a language can be at once primitive and perfect; 6. that Hebrew occupies the same position in the Semitic family of languages which Sanskrit occupies in the Aryan family, and is accordingly calculated to explain and elucidate the former in the same manner that Sanskrit has explained and elucidated the latter. Each of these propositions appears to be in the highest degree debatable, not to say definitely untrue. For instance, Hebrew is undoubtedly a language distinguished by the presence of rare merits, and displaying, at least within certain limits, a marked and unique expressiveness: but we ought surely to pause before venturing to ascribe to it without qualification such an extraordinary attribute as *perfection*. M. Renan does not indeed state in what he conceives perfection to consist, or what languages he would characterise as possessing it; but Hebrew, at any rate, in spite of its great beauties, has weaknesses which must preclude its being regarded as a perfect instrument of thought; it does not grasp its ideas with sufficient firmness and precision, or exhibit them in their relations to one another with sufficient distinctness, and there is

Obs. The opinion of Ewald, in spite of some expressions which seem to point in an opposite direction (as § 1 *b*, p. 19; § 6 *b*, p. 34), is not apparently, upon the whole, at variance with the one here advocated; his language regarding the progressiveness and development visible in Arabic, when taken in conjunction with statements to be found elsewhere, alludes in all probability to such formations as those just referred to, which are admitted on all hands to be specially Arabic in origin. Thus on p. 35 we find it remarked that Hebrew, even at the earliest period, 1500 to 2000 B.C., to which we can trace it, 'must already have sunk from an earlier level of more living growth, and in many respects have lost much of its flexibility and richness, as can be demonstrated by the most unequivocal indications;' and he refers himself to §§ 162, 211, 216, 234, 345, to which may be added 202 *a*, *c*, 203 *a*, where (cf. the Essay *Gesch. Folge*, pp. 13, 46, 49) at any rate the termination *-an* is fully recognised as a primitive Semitic case-ending. Compare also *Gram. Arab.* § 7, 'ut Arabum lingua ditissima et purissima multa ex antiquitate remotâ servavit quae vel in hebraeâ minus integra sunt et perspicua, ita' etc.; and the similar language in his criticism of Olshausen's *Lehrbuch* in the *Gött. Gel. Anzeigen*, 1861, p. 1803. It is on the question of the origin of the י- and ו- (as in רעואל, מלאתי משפט) that Ewald's divergence from the view entertained by Olshausen and Philippi is most pronounced: see *ibid.* pp. 1809–1811.

I may conclude the first part of this appendix by quoting the words of Eberhard Schrader, who, after enumerating some of the points which, in his opinion, establish incontestably the claims of

---

a want of syntactical pliability which causes it to break down under the pressure of a long-continued or complicated train of reasoning. And to suppose that any language whatever can be at once primitive and perfect seems to me like imagining a child to have the maturity of a man: where ideas, and the relations between ideas, are few and simple, the language required to express them will be simple too: hand in hand with the growing strength and scope of thought will the mechanism of language increase in power and polish, and gradually adapt itself to express with neatness and ease the intricate combinations derivable from an ever widening and enlarging circle of ideas.

Arabic to be the most faithful representative of the original mother-tongue of the Semitic race[1], sums up his general position as follows:—'Certainly each of the Semitic languages, Arabic included, can display a number of specialities which are wanting in the rest. As regards, however, those formations and general linguistic specialities which were the property of all these languages, Arabic, partly in their structural condition, partly in their fulness and in the freshness with which they live in the consciousness of the language, exhibits with marked preponderance the greater originality. Accordingly, in our opinion, hardly a doubt can exist that, in one way or other, the nearest resemblance to the original Semitic type is to be looked for in Arabic. What we should protest against is purely the one-sidedness with which people look for this type in Arabic as such, and, where possible, in Arabic as known to us from literary records: a one-sidedness which involves the identification of Arabic in particular with Semitic in general. Rather, it cannot possibly be ignored that even Arabic, as we possess it, is already the result of a long and many-sided development. But we should be forcibly shutting our own eyes, were we to regard everything that Arabic has in excess of the other Semitic languages, as *merely* Arabic accretion; we should do the same were we even merely, in point of originality, to place the particular configuration of Semitic displayed by Arabic on a lower, or in fact even upon an equal footing with Hebrew, Aramaic, or Assyrian. In conformity with the argument drawn out above, the state of the case is rather this, that, without detracting from the rich and exuberant expansion of a number of germs, which even as such are scarcely traceable in the other Semitic languages, Arabic in all essential points has preserved the original Semitic type with the greatest purity[2].'

---

[1] A few of these points have been noticed in § 181; of the rest the following may be named in passing:—the distinction of only *three* vowels; the vowel-ending and 'nunation' in nouns; the 3rd fem. pl. *yaktubna* (as against תכתבנה with the *double* mark of the fem.); an entire system of verb-modifications, and the uniform adoption of a change of vowel to denote the passive voice—both of which are but partially and incompletely carried out in Hebrew.

[2] *Ueber die Abstammung der Chaldäer und die Ursitze der Semiten*, in the D M G Z. xxvii. 1873, p. 416. The reader may consult in

185. Turning now from structure to function, we may devote the limited space which is still at our disposal to a few illustrations of the more noticeable significations that are borne by the two tenses.

§ 13. See Wright, ii. 1 *e*, and cf. Qor. iii. 75, 108. vi. 31. vii. 69.

§ 14. Ewald, *Gram. Arab.* ii. p. 347: 'Usus perfecti de re futurâ in Korano latius patet, videturque mihi vestigia quaedam hebraei perfecti cum ו relativo servare.' The use alluded to is, I believe, entirely confined to those descriptions of the 'Hour' of resurrection, or the future life, with which the Qor'an abounds; and though at times the perfect appears in the neighbourhood of other perfects without *waw* (e.g. vi. 22–31. vii. 35–49), yet it is so much more frequently found surrounded by *imperfects* (in a future sense) as to make it difficult to avoid accepting Ewald's conclusion. The list given by Ewald by no means exhausts the instances which might be found: two or three examples will, however, be sufficient for our present purpose. xi. 11, 100 he (Phar'oh) will head his people on the day of resurrection *fa'awradahum* (as though והורידם), *and lead them down* into the fire. xiv. 24–28 *and they will* come forth to God all together, *and he will* say etc. xxv. 27 and one day will the heavens be cleft *and* the angels *be sent down* descending. xliv. 54–56. l. 19–30. lxxviii. 19 f.

§ 17. Qor. vii. 87. xi. 35 إِنْ شَآءَ si *voluerit*, 45, 83 as for thy (Loṭ's) wife, on her shall light what *will have lighted* on them, 109 abiding in it as long as the heavens and earth *shall have lasted*, except

---

addition, on the same subject, Philippi, *Wesen und Ursprung des St. Constr.* (Weimar 1871), passim, especially pp. 124, 142–151, with Nöldeke's review of it in the *Gött. Gel. Anzeigen*, June 1871, p. 881. Nöldeke gives it as his opinion that the presence of vowel-terminations in old Semitic, as germs of the Arabic cases, is very probable: he only demurs to the supposition that as yet they had definitely begun to fulfil the functions of the three cases as such. Compare further Ewald's review of the same work in the Göttingen *Nachrichten*, 1871, p. 295, and his Dissertation referred to above, p. 236, which, however, is principally occupied in examining the salient features which Ewald severally singles out as characteristic of the five stages through which he conceives the Semitic languages to have passed.

thy Lord *shall have willed* otherwise. xlii. 43 cum *viderint;* after حَتَّى *until*, vi. 31. vii. 35, 36 etc.

§ 19. Cf. Qor. iii. 138, 159. vii. 149. x. 52.

§ 27. Various instances of the *inceptive* force of the imperfect:—iii. 42 he only saith to a thing, Be, فَيَكُونُ *and it is;* so 52. xix. 36 (cf. Ps. xxxiii. 9). vii. 98. xi. 40 وَيَصْنَعُ and he *went on* to build the ark. xviii. 40 وَيَقُولُ. xx. 41. lviii. 9; after إِذْ (=או), iii. 120 إِذْ تَقُولُ *then* thou *wentest on* to say; after ثُمَّ (=שם), iii. 22. xl. 69. lviii. 9, cf. xi. 77. xxi. 12. Also vii. 114. xxvi. 44 and Moses cast down his rod, and behold it *began devouring* their inventions. xi. 44 and it *began to* move.

iii. 39 when they *were busy casting* lots, 145, 147 when ye *were coming* up the height. xxi. 78 when they *were giving* judgment. xl. 10 when ye *were being* called to the faith, *and remained* unbelievers.

The inceptive force of the tense is also conspicuously displayed when it follows a verb in the past for the purpose of indicating the intention or object with which the action was performed; as iii. 117. vi. 25 when they come to thee *to dispute* with thee. vii. 72. x. 3 then ascended his throne *yudabbiru* to rule all things. xlii. 9; cf. iii. 158. xxxiv. 43 al., and Wright, ii. § 8 *d.* With יום אולד בו, cf. xix. 15 *yawma yamūtu* (=יום ימות) the day he would die on.

§ 34. Wright, ii. § 8 *e;* Qor. vii. 84 and sit not in every road *menacing and misleading* (both indic.). xi. 80.

§§ 44–46. On the energetic, see Wright, ii. § 19. Unlike the Hebrew cohortative, it is used freely in *all* the persons: the nature of its intensifying influence will be clear from the examples:—Qor. iii. 75 surely *ye shall* believe in him! 194 *la'ukaffiranna* (=כַּפֵּר אֲכַפֵּרָה) surely[1] I will forgive you your evil deeds! vi. 12 he *will* surely gather you together for the day of resurrection, 14 *do not be* of the 'associators' [i.e. the Christians]! xxxv. 80 *do not be* one of the ignorant! 77 surely, if my Lord doth not guide me, surely *I shall be* of the people that err! vii. 5 surely *we will ask!* 121 surely *I will*

---

[1] The word rendered *surely* in these examples is لَ *la,* an emphatic particle often prefixed to the energetic, and also (like כי עתה) sometimes used to mark strongly the apodosis.

crucify you! xxvi. 116 surely, unless thou desist, surely *thou shalt be* one of them that are stoned! xxxiv. 3 by my Lord, surely *it shall come* upon you!

And after إِمَّا *if at all, whether:* vi. 67 and *if* Saṭan *cause thee to forget* (=ואם נשה ינשך השטן), etc. xix. 26 (=אם ראה תראי).

vii. 33, 199. x. 47 (cf. xl. 77) *whether* we *let thee see* some of the things with which we threaten them, or (أَوْ) *take thee* to ourselves, to us is their return. xliii. 40 f.

§§ 122–129. The use of the Arabic ف *fa*, as illustrating the employment of ו to introduce the apodosis or the predicate, was already appealed to by the mediaeval grammarians and commentators: see e. g. my *Mosheh ben Shesheth*, pp. 16, 39, 80. Examples may readily be found: thus with ודעו *know then*, Ps. iv. 4, compare Qor. iii. 14 O our Lord! we have indeed believed, *so* forgive us our sins! 44 I come to you with a sign from your Lord; *so* fear God and obey me: behold God is my Lord and your Lord; *therefore* serve him! 89 God is truthful; follow, *then*, the doctrine of Abraham: and with the instances in §§ 123, 127, compare (α) iii. 49, 50 as to those who believe, *them* (ف) he will pay their reward. xxvi. 75–77 what you used to worship . . . lo, *they* are my foes!

(β) vi. 72 in the day that he saith, Be, *then* it is! xvi. 87 and when they shall have seen the punishment, *then* it will not be lightened off them. xxvi. 80. xliii. 50. l. 39 in the night, *then* praise him! (in Hebrew, with of course the perfect, ובלילה ושבחהו.)

(γ) iii. 118 (xiv. 14 f.) upon God, *there* (ف) let the believer trust! x. 59 in the grace of God and in his mercy, *why*, in this, *this* let them rejoice! xvi. 53 فَإِيَّايَ فَٱرْهَبُونِ *so* me, *me* revere! xlii. 14; constantly after من *whoso*, as iii. 70 whoever has been true to his engagement, and fears God, *why* (ف), surely God loveth those that fear him, 76, 88. xlv. 14 whoever does right, *falinafshihi* (ולנפשו) *'tis* for his own soul; after *whatever*, xlii. 8, 34; in the apod. after *if*, xl. 22 if he be a liar, *why* upon himself will be his lie; after *whether* . . . *or* . . ., x. 47. xl. 77.

The forms of hypotheticals and the circumstantial clause would also afford an interesting field for comparison: but for the present it will not perhaps be necessary to pursue the enquiry any further.

ADDENDA.

§ 21. The connection between the ideas of *incipiency* and *reiteration* is well illustrated by the use of the element -σκ- in Greek, which in words like γηράσκω, ἡβάσκω (cf. senesco, pubesco, cresco, etc.), possesses an inchoative force, while in the Homeric and Ionic forms ναιετάασκε, εἵπεσκε, ἐλάσασκε, etc., it appears as an affix expressing iteration. 'The gradual realisation and the repetition of an action are regarded by language as nearly akin' (Curtius, *Elucidations*, p. 143): hardly, however, so much because 'both form the opposite to the sudden incidental action of the aorist,' as because what is *on the way to* take place is *likely and liable* to take place; εἵπεσκε, then, meaning properly 'he was *on the point* of saying,' very quickly becomes 'he *would* or *used to* say.'

In most of the verbs ending in -σκω, the original inchoative force is no longer traceable at all, in others it is only traceable after reflection, e. g. in γιγνώσκω, μιμνήσκω, θνήσκω, στερίσκω: we thus have an interesting and clear example of a form being preserved by language, even when its meaning had become evanescent. Cf. Curtius, *das Griech. Verbum*, i. 269, 285.

§ 43. A curious misreading of a paragraph in Gesenius, which has the effect of transferring to the perfect a sense belonging to the imperfect, may be seen in the Speaker's Commentary, iv. 623 *b*.

§ 49 *β*. Cf. Ps. xvii. 15, where it seems to be generally overlooked that אשבעה (and with it of course אחזה, as xcv. 6) does not express a certainty, but only an aspiration (*may I*).

§ 62. In Lam. iii. 26 טוב ויחיל, unless we are prepared to render '[he is] good, *so* let a man hope,' I do not see what course is open except for ויחיל to read כי יחיל (cf. p. 91 *note*). Ewald, § 235 *a*, in translating *it is good that a man should hope*, seems (cf. Hupfeld on Ps. v. 12) to have confused two senses of the word *that*: ו in ויחיל can only mean *ut* or *ita ut*, whereas in his version, the clause introduced by *that* is equivalent to an accusative and infinitive (bonum est praestolari, Vulg.), which in Hebrew (see *v.* 27 and § 39 γ) would have been כי יחיל. In Hab. ii. 13 we may either with Del. suppose that ו marks the predicate (in which case ויגעו will of course be no longer volunt. but freq.), or, as this constr. is harsh and scarcely borne out by the parallels adduced, supply the object to הנה from

what precedes, 'Lo [it is] from Yahweh (sc. the conduct described in *v.* 12), *in order that*' etc. Cf. Gen. xvi. 14. 1 Sam. ix. 12 lo [he is] before thee. 1 Kings ii. 29. xxi. 18 lo [he is] in the vineyard.

§ 70. An exhaustive survey of the passages in which this *-ah* occurs may be found in Stickel, *das Buch Hiob*, p. 151, who, assigning both to *-ah* as marking the cohortative, and to *-ah* as appended to the first person after נָ a common origin and the same intensive force, supposes that in the former case this is exerted in giving prominence to the feelings *internally* actuating the speaker, while in the latter case it operates by laying stress upon the results *externally* produced. He is thus often able to imitate the effect of it in German by the use of *hin*, as ונחלמה 'und wir träumten *hin*:' so in English שכבתי ואישנה might be very fairly represented by 'I lay down, and slept *away*,'—*hin* is, however, capable of a wider application than our *away*. Compare Delitzsch on Ps. iii. 6 and Gen. xxxii. 6, where *-ah* is spoken of as a termination *welches . . . die Lebendigkeit des Verbalbegriffs steigert.*

§ 82. On Josh. ix. 21 ויהיו Mr. Espin writes, 'Render "they shall be." There is a sudden transition from the direct to the oblique style of speech.' What this latter remark may mean is not at all clear: the proposed rendering is quite inadmissible, involving, as it does, a use of וַ which, rare even in the prophets, is unheard of in simple prose narrative, and indeed in the language of ordinary life, would be ridiculously out of place. ויהיו is evidently to be taken in its usual sense, viz. *and they became*,—the result of the whole transaction being first stated summarily in *v.* 21 *b*, and the details, with an account of the part taken in it by Joshua, being added afterwards, *vv.* 22–27, according to § 76 *Obs.* 'They shall be' must have been והיו; see Gen. i. 14: in *form* the verse resembles Gen. xi. 3.

§ 104. Add Prov. vi. 22, and perh. ix. 12. Job ix. 30: cf. § 132 i *β*.

P. 148 *Obs.* With Josh. vi. 10 cf. Esth. iv. 11 ויהיה.

§ 119 *δ*. Gen. xl. 14 כי is wrongly rendered 'but:' we might rather have expected ועתה or אך (cf. xxiii. 13). How Del. can render *mögest du* . . ., and say that the pf. ו' 'has the sense of a modal fut., Ew. § 356 *b*,' I do not understand: such a meaning is unheard of as attaching to the *bare* pf., nor do the references in Ew. at all substantiate it. Knobel here assigns to ו' a sense that could only be borne by תזכר.

INDEX.

*** The references are to the sections, except where otherwise marked.

Genesis.

1, 14 . . . . . 113. 2
2, 2 . 76 *Obs.*, 149 *n.*
5 . . . 27 β, 128
6. 24 . 113. 4 α, β
18 . . . . . 39 γ
19 . . . . . 76 *Obs.*
3, 5 . . . . . 123 β
22 . . . . . p. 148
4, 15 . . . . 123 *Obs.*
6, 4 . . . 30, 113. 4
14 . . . . 107, 112
8, 17 112
12, 2 65
13 . . . . . p. 147
19 . . . 116 *Obs.* 2
13, 9 . . . . . 136 β*
14, 22 10
15, 6 133
12. 17 165
17, 4 . . 110. 4, 119 α
14. 18 . . 123, 142
20 . . . . . 113. 1
18, 12 . . . . 19. 2, 159
25 . . . . 111, 118
26 . . 110. 4, 136 α
19, 4 . . . . 27 β, 128
9. 15 . . . 79, 127 β
19 . . pp. 135, 148
23 169
20, 11 . . . . 79, 119 α
12 . . . . . 74 α
16 . . . . 125 *Obs.*
21, 7. 14. . 19. 2, 163
25 133
22, 4. 24. . . 127 α, β
22, 5 . . . . . 49 α
14 . . . . . 33 α
23, 11. 13 13
24, 8. . 171, 176, p. 123
14 . 119 δ, 126, 136 γ
14. 43 . . . p. 143
15 . . . . . p. 30
30 . . . . . 75 α
48 . . . . . p. 80
56 159
62 . . 76 *Obs.*, 160
26, 10 . . . . . p. 146
22 . . . . . 119 α
27, 23 ff. 76
30 165
33. 34 . . 117, 127 β
29, 2 f. . . 31, 113. 4 β
8 . . . . . p. 148
9 169
30, 13. 30 . 14 β, 127 α
31, 7 132
8. . 123 β, 136 *Obs.*
15 79
27 . . . . . 74 α
34 . . . 16, 76 *Obs.*
39. 42 . . . 30, 141
32, 31 . . . . . 74 β
33, 3 . . . . . p. 207
10 . . . . . 119 δ
34, 5. 7 . pp. 174, 207
37, 3 . . pp. 174, 207
7 . . 27 γ, p. 209
18 . . . . . 127 β
38, 25 169
39, 6. 23. 31
40, 9. 16. . . 125 *Obs.*
40, 14 . . 119 δ, p. 250
42, 8. 23 . . 160 *Obs.*
11. 20 . . 11, 75 *n.*
18. 35 . . 152 i, 165
43, 7 . . . . 39 β, 40
44, 4 . . . . 162, 169
5 . . . . 160 *Obs.*
9. 12 . . 123 γ, 163
22 149
45, 27 . . . . . p. 191
48, 4 . . . . . 113. 1
6. 17 . . 17, 27 γ
21 etc. 126
49, 13. 19 . . . p. 207
23 132
27 34
50, 15 142

Exodus.

1, 12 etc. 30
19 . . . . . 123 β
2, 10 . . . . . 75 α
13 etc. . . . . 39 γ
20 . . . . . p. 161
3, 13 126
18 . . . . . 49 β, 149
4, 13 . . . . . p. 41
14 etc. 149
21 . . . . . 123 β
23 79
5, 5 . . . . . 119 γ
16 . . 133, cf. 116 *n.*
7, 9 . . . . . 152 ii
8, 20 . . . . . 27 γ
22 . 124, 136 α *Obs.*
23 . . . 38 α, 110. 3

9, 15 141
17 126
19 . . . . . 123 *a*
10, 3 . . . . . 19. 1
11, 1 . . . . . 76 *Obs.*
12, 17. 44 . . . 13, 123
13, 15 . . . . . 33 *a*
14, 8 159
15, 5–7 . . . . . 27 *a*
12. 14 . . . 84 *end*
16, 6. 7 . . 123 β, 159
21 148
17, 11 120
18, 16 . . pp. 139, 140
26 120
19, 19 30
20, 25 153
21, 12. 36. 117, 138 *Obs.*
22, 26 . . . . . 39 *a*
23, 1 . . . pp. 54, 86
28, 43 . . . . . p. 146
33, 7–11 . . . 113. 4
10. 12 . . 148, 160
36, 29 f. . . . . p. 174
38 . . pp. 169, 174

Leviticus.

5, 1 etc. . . 138 *Obs.*
10, 19 155
11, 4–6 . . . . . p. 38
32 . . . . . p. 148
13, 23 162
25 . . . 136 γ *Obs.*
15, 11 . . . . . p. 144
24 . . 171, 176 *Obs.*
17, 3. 18, 5 . . p. 144
19, 8 etc 17
12 . . . . . p. 146
22, 7 149
26, 43 . . 62, 176 *Obs.*
44 13

Numbers.

4, 15. 20 . . . p. 146
5, 27 . . . . . 138 ii *a*
9, 16–23 . . 30, p. 179
9, 17 124
10, 17–27 148
11, 8. 22 . . 114, 115
12, 14 155
13, 21–24 . . . . p. 90
14, 15 . . . . . 149 β
15, 24 . . . . . 138 ii *a*
16, 5. 11 . . 125, 159
17, 28 . . . . . 19. 2
19, 13. 20 . 136 γ *Obs.*
20, 3 . . . 119 *n.*, 140
21, 9 . . . . . p. 179
20 . . . 103, p. 174
22, 5 . . . . . p. 208
18 143
33 141
23, 7. 19 . . . 27 *a*, 64
20 . . . . . p. 171
24, 7. 19 . . . . . 50 *a*
17. 14 *a*, 28, p. 171
32, 19. 23 . . 13, 136 γ
35, 16–18 . . . 138 *Obs.*

Deuteronomy.

2, 12. 15 . . 27 *a*, 115
28. 30 . . 104, 132
4, 29 149
30 . . . . . 123 β
33 . . . . . 74 β
37–39 . . . . 123 γ
5, 21 . . 38 *a*, p. 146
26 . . . . . p. 147
6, 10 f. 15 . pp. 145, 148
18. 7, 12 . . p. 147
7, 25 f. . . . . p. 146
10, 16 . . . . . 119 β
11, 10 . 110. 4 *Obs.*, cf. 113. 4
15, 12 124
16, 19 134
17, 2–4 . . . . p. 144
17 62
19, 4 . . . . . p. 144
21, 1 162
22, 1. 4 . . . . . p. 146
28, 8 etc. . 58, 113. 2
30, 16. 19 . 118, 119 δ
32, 7. 8 . . pp. 52, 60
10 . . . . . 27 *a*
18 . . . . . p. 228
26. 29 144
40 104
41 . . . . . 138 i β
33, 2. 20. 132

Joshua.

1, 15 etc. . . p. 148
2, 5 165
18 126
3, 14 f. 16 . 159, 163
6, 13 . . . . . 113. 4
9, 8. 12. . . . 28, 132
21 . . . . . p. 250
15, 3 ff. . . . 120 *Obs.*
22, 17 76
18 . . . . 155, 165

Judges.

1, 12 . . . 115, 123 γ
2, 1 . . . . . 27 *a*
18 f. 120, 121, p. 179
3, 23. 24 . . 133, 169
26 160
4, 14 . . . . . 14 *a*
5, 8 . . . . . 39 β
26 . . . . 27 *a*, 132
6, 5 [not 4]. 30 f., 114 *Obs.*
13 149
31 . . . . . 50 *a*
36 f. . . . . 119 δ
7, 13 133
8, 8. 19. . . . 76, 139
9, 9 . . . . 19, p. 145
16–19. . 138 ii β*
13, 5 . . . . . p. 208
15, 3 . . . . 13, 137 γ
7 146
16, 2 etc. . . . p. 148
18 133
20. 31 160
18, 3 169

1 Samuel.

1, 3. 4. 7 etc. . . 120
22 . . . . . p. 148
2, 13–15. 31, 123 β, 126
16 . . 114 β, 136 γ
21. 25 . pp. 91, 108
29 . . . . . p. 147
3, 7 . . . . . 27 β
13 etc. 133
4, 19 . 118 *Obs.*, 133
20 etc. . . . 127 β
5, 7 . . . . . p. 174
6, 9 [not 10] . p. 179
9, 7 124
11. 14 . . 168, 169
10, 5 . . . . 121 *Obs.*
8 . . . . . 50 *Obs.*
11 etc. . . . 127 a
13, 21 f. . 114 β, 120
14, 10 17
24 . . . . . p. 148
15, 23 . . . . . 127 γ
28 . . . . . 119 a
16, 14 . . . . . p. 174
17, 20 . . . . . 123 β
35 . . . 110. 2 *Obs.*
18, 21 62
20, 22. 36 . . . 17, 169
21, 15 . . . . . 28, 39 γ
23, 2 . . pp. 123, 145
26, 9 . . 19. 2, cf. 115
27, 4. 9 . pp. 108, 174
29, 8 . . . 104, p. 145

2 Samuel.

1, 10 . . . . 40, 66 *n.*
3, 8 . . . . 74 β, 79
33 . . . . . 39 β
4, 10 . . . 127 a, 160
5, 8 f. . 76 *Obs.*, 117
24 . . . . 121 *Obs.*
6, 16. 7, 11. . . . 133
9, 10 104
10, 5 . . . . . p. 148
11, 4 . . . . . p. 216
12, 8 . . . . . 136 β*
12, 16 . . . . . 113. 4
18 . . . . . p. 143
21 161
13, 18. 26 . . 133, 149
14, 15 . . . . . 33 a
15, 4 . . . . . p. 147
30 . . . . . 113. 4
34 . . . . 125 *Obs.*
37 . . 27 γ, p. 108
16, 13 . . . . . p. 174
17, 17 120
18, 12 . . . 119 *n.*, 145
13 144
22 . 122 *n.*, 152 iii
19, 18 f. . . . . p. 174
30. 41 . . . 10, 127
20, 6 . . . . . 41 *Obs.*
12 . . . . . p. 174
21, 3 65
23, 3. 4 . 125 *Obs.*, 164

1 Kings.

1, 6. 13. . pp. 42, 208
2, 6 . . . . 171, 176
31 . . . 110. 5 *Obs.*
44 . . . . . 119 a
3, 7 162
4, 7 etc. 120
6, 15 etc. 163
7, 8. 26 . . 27 γ, 30
8, 32. 43 124
10, 24 f. . . pp. 34, 208
13, 33 63
14, 5 . . . . 121 *Obs.*
17 166
28 . . 78. 1, 113. 4
18, 4 120
10 . . . . 37 β, 148
11 f. . 126, 165 *end*
20, 28 . . . . . 123 γ
33. 36 . . 27 γ, 126
21, 6 . . . . . 27 γ
22, 1 164
28 . . . . . p. 179

2 Kings.

2, 16 . . . . . 41 *Obs.*
3, 4. 14. . . 120, 145
25 . . . . . 113. 4
27 etc. . . . 39 β
5, 6. 17 . . 119 β, 149
20 . . . 14 a, p. 140
6, 5 165
10 114
7, 4 . . . . . 138 i a
9 126
8, 13. 21 . . 39 γ, 165
29 . . . . . 27 γ
10, 12 f. . . . . p. 216
15 149
11, 1 129
13, 14 . . . . . 39 β
14, 10 . . . 115, 119 γ
17, 7 . . . . . 75 β
22, 17 . . . . . 123 γ

Isaiah.

1, 2 etc. 132
15 143
21 etc. 30
2, 8 etc. 36
9 . . . . . 57, 82
5, 8 . . . . . p. 148
12 . . . . . 113. 4
13–16 etc. 14 a, 81
19 . . . pp. 49, 69
29 159
30 . 14 γ, 109 *Obs.*
6, 2 f. . . . 31, 113. 4
7 . . . . . 119 a
11 f. . . . . p. 148
13 . . . 110. 5, 149
7, 23 30
8, 9. 10 . . . 152 i, ii
9, 1–5 . . . . 14, 81
4 . . . . . 123 a
10, 13 . . . . . 84 a
11, 8. 9 etc. 14, 109 *Obs.*
12, 1 . . . . . p. 106
15, 6 11
16, 12. 14 . . . 17, 123
21, 7 . . . . . 149 β
12 . . . 40, 136 β*

25, 8. 9 . . . 14 γ, 63
26, 9. 10. . 136 γ, 155
15 20
27, 5 . . . . 176 *Obs.*
6 . . . . . 50 *a*
28, 28 . . . . . p. 145
29, 8. 11 . pp. 144, 145
15 . . . . 117, 118
30, 14 . . . . . 34, 162
35, 1 f. . . . . 50 *a*
4 . .171, 176, p. 52
36, 19 . . . . . p. 154
37, 26 129
38, 10. 21 . . 52, p. 94
39, 1 . . . . . 75 *a*
40, 6 . . . . . p. 174
25 etc. 64
41, 2 . . . . . .64 *Obs.*
28 . 46 *n.*, 64, 152 iii
42, 6 . . . . 176 *Obs.*
43, 4. 8 . . . 125, 159
9. 12 . . . 20, 132
14 etc. . . .113. 1
17 . . . . . 27 *a*
28 . . . pp. 73, 105
44, 12 . . . 114, 123 β
15 . 113. 4, cf. 114
17 . . . . 33 *a*, 134
20 161
45, 4 . . . 27 *a*, 127 γ
47, 10. 11 . . 118, 162
12. 13 . . . . 50 *a*
48, 7. 128
18 f. . . 127 γ, 140
49, 7. 21. . . . .76. 160
50, 2 . . . . . p. 106
51, 2 . . . . .27 *a*, 84 *a*
6. 11. . . . 14 β, γ
12 . . . 34, 80 *end*
53, 2 . . . . . 64, 81
4. 5. 7. 12 . . . 160
54, 10 . . . . . p. 187
14 57
56, 4 . . . 115, 123 *a*
57, 3 117
58, 10 . . pp. 199, 227
59, 10. 15 . . . 52, 79
60, 15 etc. . . . 123 γ
63, 3 . 84 *a*, 176 *Obs.*
19 140
64, 1 118
65, 8. 24. . . 115, 124
66, 7 . . . . . 123 γ
9 . . . 104, 119 γ

Jeremiah.

3, 25 52
4, 2 104
19 etc. 53
5, 6 etc. . . . . 14 *a*
6, 4 28
17 . . . 114 β, 120
19 . . . . . .127 *a*
7, 9 f. . 113 1, cf. 4 *a*
10, 18 . . . 110. 5 *Obs.*
12, 3 . . . . 113. 4 *a*
13, 10 . . . 62, cf. 117
17, 5. 21 . pp. 143, 144
18, 4 . . . 114 β, 148
20, 9 . . . 113. 4, 148
17 . . . . . 75 *a*
23, 14. 113 δ, cf. 117 *Obs.*
18. 22 . . 64, 144
25, 5 . . . . . 152 i
36, 18 . . . . . p. 47
38, 9 79
44, 25 . . . . . .127 *a*
46, 6 58
49, 9 . .136 β, 138 i γ
19 55
51, 14 . . . . . p. 146

Ezekiel.

3, 19 . . . . 138 ii γ
21 17
13, 6 64
11 . . . . 62, 117 ?
14, 7 . . . . 171, 176
16, 19 129
18, 13. 24 . . . 123 β
22, 2 . . . . . 119 β
28, 16 82
33, 6 . . . . . .136 γ
36, 18 118

Hosea.

4, 10 . . . . . 14 γ
6, 1 . . 84 β, 152 iii
7, 7 . . . . . 113. 4
8, 12 . . . . 155 *Obs.*
11, 4 . . pp. 106, 228
14, 6 f. . . . . 50 *a*

Joel.

2, 20 . . pp. 218, 228
23 81
4, 21 104

Amos.

1, 8 . . . 110. 5 *Obs.*
11 . . . . . .79, 118
3, 8 154
4, 7 . . . 114, p. 140
5, 4. 6. . . . . .152 i
19 . . . . . p. 145
6, 1. 3. 5 etc. . . . 117
9, 2–4 . . .113. 3, 143

Micah.

1, 10 20
3, 4 . . . . 176 *Obs.*
5, 2. 7 . . 17, 138 i *a*
6, 14 . . . . . .152 iii

Habakkuk.

1, 9 f. 82
2, 1 f. 54
10. 13 . pp. 209, 249
3, 3. 7. 9. 12. . 27, 28

Zephaniah.

1, 17 . . . 110. 5 *Obs.*
2, 2 . . . . . 14 β
13 . .171, 176 *Obs.*

Zechariah.

5, 3 f. .13, 45 *n.*, 113. 1
10, 7 . . . . . 50 *a*, 58

Malachi.

1, 2 etc. . . . . 119 γ

Psalms.

1, 2–6 . . . . . 33 *b*

2, 1. 12 . . . . 35, 116
4, 2 etc. 9, 20
5, 8 . . . . . 37 *a*
6, 7 etc. 35
9 etc. . . . . 14 *β*
7, 7. . . . . 20, 163
13 f. etc. . 14 *γ*, 35
16 . . . . . 12, 27 *a*
8, 6 . . . . 14 *γ end*
9, 9 . . . . . p. 208
10 62
10, 10 . . . 113. 4, 161
11 79
11, 3 . . . . . 19. 2
6 etc. . 58, 176 *Obs.*
12, 9. 14, 6 . . . 38 *a*
16, 9 35
17, 5. 12 . . . . 8, 28
14 etc. . . 113. 4
15 . . . . . p. 249
18, 7. 8. 38 . . . 84, 85
26–28 . . . . 33 *b*
34 f. . . . . cf. 117
20, 7 13
21, 12 . . . 138 i, 162
22, 22. 27 . . 20, 50 *γ*
29 . . . . . p. 209
30 . . . . . 14 *a*, 81
23, 4 143
25, 11 . . . . . 119 *δ*
26, 12 etc. . . . . 14 *a*
27, 2. 13 . . . 132, 140
28, 1 . . . 104, p. 148
29, 10 79
30, 8 16
31, 7 . . . . . p. 208
8 f. 32, 4. 7, 8 *Obs.*
32, 5 . . 27 *a*, 85 *Obs.*
34, 6 58
35, 8 162
15 f. 21 . . . 8 *Obs.*
37, 10 153
20. 38, 17. . 14 *γ*
39, 3. 5 . . . . 12, 49 *β*
40, 6 . . . . . 155 *Obs.*
41, 3. 7 . . 57, 138 i *β*
41, 13 79
42, 5 . . . . . 30, 52
44, 21 f. 144
45, 12 . . . . . 152 iv
46, 7 etc. . . . 84 *end*
49, 10 63
11 etc. . . 113. 4
15 80
50, 3. 6 . . 58, 82 *Obs.*
15 etc. . . . 152 ii
16. 18 . 118, 127 *β*
21 . . . 104, 119 *γ*
51, 18. 55, 13 . . 64
55, 18. . 52, 54, 82 *Obs.*
22 etc. . 159, 160
57, 4 154
5 55
58, 5 . . . . 171, 176
11 etc. . . 138 i *β*
59, 4. 5 164
16 . . . . . 127 *γ*
60, 11 . . . . . 19. 2
62, 10 155
64, 7 159
8–10. 11 . 82, 113. 2
65, 5 49
66, 6 . . . . . 54, 84
7. 18 . . . . 58, 144
68, 15 . . pp. 219, 228
69, 4 161
15 . . . 49 *β*, p. 69
33 . . 50 *a*, 84, 125
71, 3 . . . . . 20, 163
17 . . . . . 33 *a*
21. 23 . 50 *Obs.*, 55
72, 8 etc. 58
73, 11. 15 . 113. 4, 139
17 . . . . 27 *β*, 54
77, 4. 7 . . 52, 82 *Obs.*
78, 30 f. . . . 128, 169
80, 5 . . . . . 19. 1
81, 9. 14–17 . 142, 145
16 63
85, 9 . . . . . p. 69
11. 14 . . . 14 *a*, 58
88, 5 164
88, 16 53
90, 3. 5 . . . . . 84 *β*
17 62
92, 8 . . . . 117, 118
11 . 74 *a*, 82 *Obs.*
14 161
94, 18 . . . . 138 i *β*
23 82
95, 7 [not 6] . . 142
10. 99, 6 f. . 30, 31
104, 20. 32 . . 152 iii
28–30. pp. 194, 198
106, 23 139
43 . . . . 160 *Obs.*
109, 28 . . . . . 38 *a*
115, 7 124
119, 17. 126 . 152 ii, 163
121, 3 . . 58, 171 *Obs.*
128, 5 65
138, 3 . . . . . 127 *β*
139, 8–10 143
18 154
141, 5 [not 6]. . 123 *β*
143, 7 . . . 105, 115
147, 18 . . 151, 152 iii

Proverbs.

3, 3 f. 7 f. etc. . 152 i, ii
24 149
25. 28 . . . 57, 159
6, 3 . . . 136 *γ Obs.*
22 . . . 149, p. 250
7, 7. 13 . . 54, 114 *Obs.*
8, 35 etc. 15
9, 4. 16 . pp. 133, 163
12 . . . . . 138 i *β*
14 . . . . . 113. 4
10, 3 etc. . . . . 33 *b*
11, 2 etc. . . . 80, 153
15, 25 . . 84, 171, 176
16, 29 etc. . . 113. 4
19, 24 etc. 154
20, 22. 25 . . . 62, 152
23, 8. 25 . 104, 176 *Obs.*
24, 27 . . . . . 123 *β*
28 . . . . . 19. 2

25, 4 f. 16 . . 153, 154
27, 17 . . . . . 152 iii
29, 9 126
30, 9 . . . 104, p. 149

Job.

2, 3 79
3, 3. 11 etc. . . 27 *a*
13 etc. . 141, 142
20. 24 . . 39 γ, 114
4, 3 f. etc. 30
5. 6. . 80, 125 *Obs.*
19 . . . . . 37 *a*
5, 5 f. etc. . .113. 4 *a*
11. 19 f. 23 . . 14 γ
22 57
24 f. . . . 104, 149
6, 2 f. 142
8–10 . pp. 71, 147
17 . . . . . 27 γ
7, 4. . 104, 110. 2 *Obs.*
4. 13 f. . . 138 i *a*
15 etc 79
20 . . 154, cf. 74 *a*
8, 4 . . . . . 127 γ
6 . . . 113. 3, 142
12 . . . . . 34, 124
9, 4 . . 9, 19. 2, 161
15 f. 144
17 . . . . . 113. 3
20 *b* . . . . cf. 153
30 f. . . . . 138 i β
33 . . . . 176 *Obs.*
34 f. . . . . 152 iii
10, 3 . 39 γ, cf. 14 *end*
8 79
16 f. . . . . 152 iii
19 18
11, 10. 116, cf. 136 *a* *Obs.*
13 f. . . . . 138 i
17 . . 45 *n.*, 152 iii
18 . . . . . cf. 149
13, 27 etc. 171, 176 *Obs.*
14, 14 . . . . . p. 145
15, 7 . . . . . 27 *a*
13. 17 . . 115, 125
33 etc. . 84, 171, 176
16, 4. 6 143
17, 13–15 . . . 138 i γ
18, 4 161
9 etc. . 58, 84 β, 176
19, 18 . . . 54, p. 169
28 f. . . . . 136 β*
20, 12–14 . . . . 136 γ
17. 24 . . . 58, 152
21, 7. 34. . . 14 γ *end*
22 160
31 . . . 154, p. 208
22, 13 104
18 . . . . . 20, 160
21 . pp. 49, 52, 196
28. 29 . 152 iii, 153
23, 10 . . . . . 84, 154
12. 13 . . 124, 153
24, 10 etc. . 161, 164
22 . . . . . 159 *end*
24 154
25, 5 124
27, 8 . . . . 171, 176
29, 11. 24 . . 153, 162
30, 26 . . . pp. 54, 169
31, 29 . . . 104, 113. 4
34 162
32, 21 . . . . . p. 54
22 142
33, 19 . . . 113. 4, 159
23–25 . . 137 γ, cf. 138 ii
34, 29 . . 152 iii, p. 208
37, 15 118
20. 21 . . . 9, 153
38, 8. 21 . . .27 *a*, 37 β
24 . . . . 171, 176
40, 32 . . . . . 152 i
41, 3. 18 . . . . 64, 165
42, 5. 16

Canticle.

2, 3. 10. 6, 1 . . . 133
3, 4. . . pp. 108, 205

Ruth.

1, 11 . . . . . p. 145
3, 3. 9. . . . . 119 δ
4. . . . . 121 *Obs.*
4, 3. 5 . . . . 13, 124

Lamentations.

1, 19. 21 . . . 63, 154
3, 8 . . .27 *a*, p. 180
26 . . . . . p. 249
55–61 . .8 *Obs.*, 20
5, 3 164

Qohéleth.

1, 7. 4, 1. 7 . . . 133
6, 3 143

Daniel.

1, 10 . . . . . p. 147
18. 20 127
8, 4. 7 etc. . p. 174
12 . . . . 176 *Obs.*
9, 25 . . . . . 50 *Obs.*
11, 4 etc. 171, 176 *Obs.*

Nehemiah.

1, 8 155
9 . . . . 143, 149
12, 39 etc. 133
13, 19 64

1 Chronicles.

11, 8 30
23, 25 79

2 Chronicles.

10, 5 . . . . . p. 163
18, 12 . . . . . p. 161
21, 9 . . . . . 165 *end*

August, 1874.

BOOKS

PRINTED AT

THE CLARENDON PRESS, OXFORD,

AND PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY BY

MACMILLAN AND CO.,

29 & 30, BEDFORD STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON.

LEXICONS, GRAMMARS, &c.

A Greek-English Lexicon, by Henry George Liddell, D.D., and Robert Scott, D.D. *Sixth Edition, Revised and Augmented.* 1870. 4to. *cloth,* 1*l.* 16*s.*

A Greek-English Lexicon, abridged from the above, chiefly for the use of Schools. *Fourteenth Edition, carefully revised throughout,* 1871. square 12mo. *cloth,* 7*s.* 6*d.*

A copious Greek-English Vocabulary, compiled from the best authorities. 1850. 24mo. *bound,* 3*s.*

Graecae Grammaticae Rudimenta in usum Scholarum. Auctore Carolo Wordsworth, D.C.L. *Seventeenth Edition,* 1870. 12mo. *bound,* 4*s.*

A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation, by H. W. Chandler, M.A. 1862. 8vo. *cloth,* 10*s.* 6*d.*

Scheller's Lexicon of the Latin Tongue, with the German explanations translated into English by J. E. Riddle, M.A. 1835. fol. *cloth,* 1*l.* 1*s.*

A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language, arranged with reference to the Classical Languages of Europe, for the use of English Students, by Monier Williams, M.A. *Third Edition,* 1864. 8vo. *cloth,* 15*s.*

A Sanskrit English Dictionary, Etymologically and Philologically arranged, with special reference to Greek, Latin, German, Anglo-Saxon, English, and other cognate Indo-European Languages. By Monier Williams, M.A., Boden Professor of Sanskrit. 1872. 4to. *cloth,* 4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.*

An Icelandic-English Dictionary. By the late R Cleasby. Enlarged and completed by G. Vigfusson. With an Introduction, and Life of R. Cleasby, by G. Webbe Dasent, D.C.L. 4to. *cloth,* 3*l.* 7*s.*

GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS.

Aeschylus: Tragoediae et Fragmenta, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. *Second Edition*, 1851. 8vo. *cloth*, 5*s*. 6*d*.

Sophocles: Tragoediae et Fragmenta, ex recensione et cum commentariis Guil. Dindorfii. *Third Edition*, 2 vols. 1860. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 1*l*. 1*s*.

Each Play separately, *limp*, 2*s*. 6*d*.

The Text alone, printed on writing paper, with large margin, royal 16mo. *cloth*, 8*s*.

The Text alone, square 16mo. *cloth*, 3*s*. 6*d*.

Each Play separately, *limp*, 6*d*.

Sophocles: Tragoediae et Fragmenta cum Annotatt. Guil. Dindorfii. Tomi II. 1849. 8vo. *cloth*, 10*s*.

The Text, Vol. I. 5*s*. 6*d*. The Notes, Vol. II. 4*s*. 6*d*.

Euripides: Tragoediae et Fragmenta, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. Tomi II. 1834. 8vo. *cloth*, 10*s*.

Aristophanes: Comoediae et Fragmenta, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. Tomi II. 1835. 8vo. *cloth*, 11*s*.

Aristoteles; ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri. Accedunt Indices Sylburgiani. Tomi XI. 1837. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*l*. 10*s*.

Each volume separately, 5*s*. 6*d*.

Catulli Veronensis Liber. Recognovit, apparatum criticum prolegomena appendices addidit, Robinson Ellis, A.M. 1867. 8vo. *cloth*, 16*s*.

Catulli Veronensis Carmina Selecta, secundum recognitionem Robinson Ellis, A.M. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s*. 6*d*.

Demosthenes: ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. Tomi IV. 1846. 8vo. *cloth*, 1*l*. 1*s*.

Homerus: Ilias, ex rec. Guil. Dindorfii. 1856. 8vo. *cloth*, 5*s*. 6*d*.

Homerus: Odyssea, ex rec. Guil. Dindorfii. 1855. 8vo. *cloth*, 5*s*. 6*d*.

Plato: The Apology, with a revised Text and English Notes, and a Digest of Platonic Idioms, by James Riddell, M.A. 1867. 8vo. *cloth*, 8*s*. 6*d*.

Plato: Philebus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by Edward Poste, M.A. 1860. 8vo. *cloth*, 7*s*. 6*d*.

Plato: Sophistes and Politicus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. 1866. 8vo. *cloth*, 18*s*.

Plato: Theaetetus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. 1861. 8vo. *cloth*, 9*s*.

Plato: The Dialogues, translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions. By B. Jowett, M.A., Master of Balliol College, and Regius Professor of Greek. 4 vols. 1871. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*l*. 6*s*.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

The Holy Bible in the Earliest English Versions, made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his followers: edited by the Rev. J. Forshall and Sir F. Madden. 4 vols. 1850. royal 4to. *cloth*, 3*l.* 3*s.*

The Holy Bible: an exact reprint, page for page, of the Authorized Version published in the year 1611. Demy 4to. *half bound*, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Vetus Testamentum Graece secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum. Accedit potior varietas Codicis Alexandrini. Tomi III. 1848. 18mo. *cloth*, 14*s.*

Novum Testamentum Graece. Edidit Carolus Lloyd, S.T.P.R., necnon Episcopus Oxoniensis. 1869. 18mo. *cloth*, 3*s.*

The same on writing paper, small 4to. *cloth*, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Novum Testamentum Graece juxta Exemplar Millianum. 1868. 18mo. *cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

The same on writing paper, small 4to. *cloth*, 6*s.* 6*d.*

Evangelia Sacra Graece. 1870. fcap. 8vo. *limp*, 1*s.* 6*d.*

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, &c.

Baedae Historia Ecclesiastica. Edited, with English Notes, by G. H. Moberly, M.A. 1869. crown 8vo. *cloth*, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, and other Works. 10 vols. 1855. 8vo. *cloth*. *Price reduced from* 5*l.* 5*s.* *to* 3*l.* 3*s.*

Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, according to the Text of Burton. With an Introduction by William Bright, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford. Crown 8vo. *cloth*, 8*s.* 6*d.*

The Orations of St. Athanasius against the Arians. With an Account of his Life. By William Bright, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford. Crown 8vo. *cloth*, 9*s.*

Patrum Apostolicorum, S. Clementis Romani, S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi, quae supersunt. Edidit Guil. Jacobson, S.T.P.R. Tomi II. *Fourth Edition*, 1863. 8vo. *cloth*, 1*l.* 1*s.*

ENGLISH THEOLOGY.

Butler's Works, with an Index to the Analogy. 2 vols. 1849. 8vo. *cloth*, 11*s.*

Greswell's Harmonia Evangelica. *Fifth Edition*, 1856. 8vo. *cloth*, 9*s.* 6*d.*

Hooker's Works, with his Life by Walton, arranged by John Keble, M.A. *Fifth Edition*, 3 vols. 1865. 8vo. *cloth*, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

Hooker's Works; the text as arranged by John Keble, M.A. 2 vols. 1865. 8vo. *cloth*, 11*s.*

Pearson's Exposition of the Creed. Revised and corrected by E. Burton, D.D. *Fifth Edition*, 1864. 8vo. *cloth*, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, with a Preface by the present Bishop of London. 1868. crown 8vo. *cloth*, 6*s.* 6*d.*

ENGLISH HISTORY.

Clarendon's (Edw. Earl of) History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. To which are subjoined the Notes of Bishop Warburton. 7 vols. 1849. medium 8vo. *cloth*, 2*l.* 10*s.*

Clarendon's (Edw. Earl of) History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. 7 vols. 1839. 18mo. *cloth*, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Freeman's (E. A.) History of the Norman Conquest of England: its Causes and Results. Vols. I. and II. 8vo. *New Edition, with Index*, 1*l.* 16*s.*

Vol. III. The Reign of Harold and the Interregnum. 1869. 8vo. *cloth*, 1*l.* 1*s.*
Vol. IV. The Reign of William. 1871. 8vo. *cloth*, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Rogers's History of Agriculture and Prices in England, A.D. 1259—1400. 2 vols. 1866. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*l.* 2*s.*

MATHEMATICS, PHYSICAL SCIENCE, &c.

An Account of Vesuvius, by John Phillips, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Geology, Oxford. 1869. Crown 8vo. *cloth*, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Treatise on Infinitesimal Calculus. By Bartholomew Price, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy, Oxford.

Vol. I. Differential Calculus. *Second Edition*, 1858. 8vo. *cloth*, 14*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. II. Integral Calculus, Calculus of Variations, and Differential Equations. *Second Edition*, 1865. 8vo. *cloth*, 18*s.*

Vol. III. Statics, including Attractions; Dynamics of a Material Particle. *Second Edition*, 1868. 8vo. *cloth*, 16*s.*

Vol IV. Dynamics of Material Systems; together with a Chapter on Theoretical Dynamics, by W. F. Donkin, M.A., F.R.S. 1862. 8vo. *cloth*, 16*s.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

A Course of Lectures on Art, delivered before the University of Oxford. By John Ruskin, M.A., Slade Professor of Fine Art. 1870. 8vo. *cloth*, 6*s.*

A Critical Account of the Drawings by Michel Angelo and Raffaello in the University Galleries, Oxford. By J. C. Robinson, F.S.A. 1870. Crown 8vo. *cloth*, 4*s.*

Bacon's Novum Organum, edited, with English Notes, by G. W. Kitchin, M.A. 1855. 8vo. *cloth*, 9*s.* 6*d.*

Bacon's Novum Organum, translated by G. W. Kitchin, M.A. 1855. 8vo. *cloth*, 9*s.* 6*d.*

Smith's Wealth of Nations. A new Edition, with Notes, by J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. *cloth*, 21*s.*

The Student's Handbook to the University and Colleges of Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Clarendon Press Series.

The Delegates of the Clarendon Press having undertaken the publication of a series of works, chiefly educational, and entitled the Clarendon Press Series, have published, or have in preparation, the following.

Those to which prices are attached are already published; the others are in preparation.

I. GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS, &c.

An Elementary Latin Grammar. By John B. Allen, M.A., formerly Scholar of New College, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth.*

A First Latin Reader. By T. J. Nunns, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth.*

A Greek Primer, in English, for the use of beginners. By the Right Rev. Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L., Bishop of St. Andrews. *Fourth Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 1*s.* 6*d.*

Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective; their forms, meaning, and quantity; embracing all the Tenses used by Greek writers, with reference to the passages in which they are found. By W. Veitch. *New Edition.* Crown 8vo. *cloth,* 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Elements of Greek Accentuation (for Schools): abridged from his larger work by H. W. Chandler, M.A., Waynflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, Oxford. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Orations of Demosthenes and Aeschines on the Crown. With Introductory Essays and Notes. By G. A. Simcox, M.A., and W. H. Simcox, M.A. Demy 8vo. *cloth,* 12*s.*

Aristotle's Politics. By W. L. Newman, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

Arrian. Selections (for Schools). With Notes. By J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L., Assistant Master in Rugby School.

The Golden Treasury of Ancient Greek Poetry; being a Collection of the finest passages in the Greek Classic Poets, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. Wright, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 8*s.* 6*d.*

A Golden Treasury of Greek Prose; being a Collection of the finest passages in the principal Greek Prose Writers, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. Wright, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford; and J. E. L. Shadwell, M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Homer. Iliad. By D. B. Monro, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, Oxford.

Also a smaller edition for Schools.

Homer. Odyssey, Books I–XII (for Schools). By W. W. Merry, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Lincoln College, Oxford. *Third Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Homer. Odyssey, Books I–XII. By W. W. Merry, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Lincoln College, Oxford; and the late James Riddell, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

Homer. Odyssey, Books XIII–XXIV. By Robinson Ellis, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

Plato. Selections (for Schools). With Notes. By B. Jowett, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek; and J. Purves, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Balliol College, Oxford.

Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. With English Notes and Introductions. By Lewis Campbell, M.A., Professor of Greek, St. Andrews, formerly Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford.

Vol. I. Oedipus Tyrannus. Oedipus Coloneus. Antigone. 8vo. *cloth,* 14*s.*

Sophocles. The Text of the Seven Plays. For the use of Students in the University of Oxford. By the same Editor. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Sophocles. In Single Plays, with English Notes, &c. By Lewis Campbell, M.A., Professor of Greek, St. Andrews, and Evelyn Abbott, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford.

Oedipus Tyrannus. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 1*s.* 9*d.*
Oedipus Coloneus. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 1*s.* 9*d.* *Just Published.*
Antigone. *In the Press.*
The others to follow at intervals of six months.

Sophocles. Oedipus Rex: Dindorf's Text, with Notes by the Ven. Archdeacon Basil Jones. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 1*s.* 6*d.*

Theocritus (for Schools). With Notes. By H. Snow, M.A., Assistant Master at Eton College. *Second Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Xenophon. Selections (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L., Assistant Master in Rugby School.

Part I. *Second Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 3*s.* 6*d.*
Part II. By the same Editor. *Preparing.*

Caesar. The Commentaries (for Schools). Part I. The Gallic War, with Notes and Maps, &c. By Charles E. Moberly, M.A., Assistant Master in Rugby School; formerly Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Part II. The Civil War. Book I. By the same Editor. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 2*s.*

Cicero's Philippic Orations. With Notes. By J. R. King, M.A., formerly Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Oxford. Demy 8vo. *cloth,* 10*s.* 6*d.*

Cicero. Select Letters. With English Introductions, Notes, and Appendices. By Albert Watson, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Brasenose College, Oxford. Demy 8vo. *cloth,* 18*s.*

Cicero. Select Letters (Text). By the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 3*s.* 6*d.* *Just Published.*

Cicero. Select Letters (for Schools). With Notes. By the late C. E. Prichard, M.A., and E. R. Bernard, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 3*s.*

Cicero pro Cluentio. With Introduction and Notes. By W. Ramsay, M.A. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A., Professor of Humanity, Glasgow. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s*. 6*d*.

Cicero de Oratore. With Introduction and Notes. By A. S. Wilkins, M.A., Professor of Latin, Owens College, Manchester.

Cicero. Selection of interesting and descriptive passages. With Notes. By Henry Walford, M.A., Wadham College, Oxford, Assistant Master at Haileybury College. In three Parts. *Third Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 4*s*. 6*d*.

Each Part separately, in limp cloth, 1*s*. 6*d*.

Part I. Anecdotes from Grecian and Roman History.
Part II. Omens and Dreams: Beauties of Nature.
Part III. Rome's Rule of her Provinces.

Cornelius Nepos. With Notes, by Oscar Browning, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and Assistant Master at Eton College. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s*. 6*d*.

Horace. With Introductions and Notes. By Edward C. Wickham, M.A., Head Master of Wellington College.

Vol. I. The Odes, Carmen Seculare, and Epodes. Demy 8vo. *cloth*, 12*s*. *Just Published.*

Also a small edition for Schools.

Livy, Books I–X. By J. R. Seeley, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College, and Regius Professor of Modern History, Cambridge. Book I. Demy 8vo. *cloth*, 6*s*.

Also a small edition for Schools.

Livy. Selections (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By H. Lee Warner, M.A., Assistant Master at Rugby School. *In Parts.*

Part I. The Caudine Disaster. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 1*s*. 6*d*.
Part II. Hannibal's Campaign in Italy. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 1*s*. 6*d*.

Ovid. Selections for the use of Schools. With Introductions and Notes, and an Appendix on the Roman Calendar. By W. Ramsay, M.A. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A., Professor of Humanity, Glasgow. *Second Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 5*s*. 6*d*.

Persius. The Satires. With a Translation and Commentary. By John Conington, M.A., late Corpus Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford. Edited by H. Nettleship, M.A. 8vo. *cloth*, 7*s*. 6*d*.

Pliny. Select Letters (for Schools). With Notes. By the late C. E. Prichard, M.A., formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, and E. R. Bernard, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s*.

Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin. With Introduction, Notes, and Illustrations. By John Wordsworth, M.A., Brasenose College, Oxford. *In the Press.*

Selections from the less known Latin Poets. By North Pinder, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. Demy 8vo. *cloth*, 15*s*.

Passages for Translation into Latin. For the use of Passmen and others. Selected by J. Y. Sargent, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. *Third Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s*. 6*d*.

II. MENTAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

The Elements of Deductive Logic, designed mainly for the use of Junior Students in the Universities. By T. Fowler, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. *Fifth Edition,* with a Collection of Examples. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Elements of Inductive Logic, designed mainly for the use of Students in the Universities. By the same Author. *Second Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 6*s.*

A Manual of Political Economy, for the use of Schools. By J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.A., formerly Professor of Political Economy, Oxford. *Second Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth,* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Principles of Morals. By J. M. Wilson, B.D., and T. Fowler, M.A. *Preparing.*

III. MATHEMATICS, &c.

Figures made Easy: a first Arithmetic Book. (Introductory to 'The Scholar's Arithmetic.') By Lewis Hensley, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. *cloth,* 6*d.*

Answers to the Examples in Figures made Easy. By the same Author. Crown 8vo. *cloth,* 1*s.*

The Scholar's Arithmetic. By the same Author. Crown 8vo. *cloth,* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Book-keeping. By R. G. C. Hamilton, Accountant to the Board of Trade, and John Ball (of the Firm of Messrs. Quilter, Ball, & Co.). *Third Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *limp cloth,* 1*s.* 6*d.*

A Course of Lectures on Pure Geometry. By Henry J. Stephen Smith, M.A., F.R.S., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, and Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford.

An Elementary Treatise on Quaternions. By P. G. Tait, M.A. *Second Edition.* Demy 8vo. *cloth,* 14*s.*

Acoustics. By W. F. Donkin, M.A., F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Astronomy, Oxford. Crown 8vo. *cloth,* 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism. By J. Clerk Maxwell, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Experimental Physics in the University of Cambridge. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. *cloth,* 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

An Elementary Treatise on the same subject. By the same Author. *Preparing.*

A Series of Elementary Works is being arranged, and will shortly be announced.

IV. HISTORY.

A Constitutional History of England. By W. Stubbs, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History, Oxford. Vol. I. Crown 8vo. *cloth,* 12*s.*

Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History from the Earliest Times to the reign of Edward I. By the same Author. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. *cloth,* 8*s.* 6*d.*

Genealogical Tables illustrative of Modern History. By H. B. George, M.A., Fellow of New College. Small 4to. *cloth*, 12*s*.

A History of France, down to the year 1453. With numerous Maps, Plans, and Tables. By G. W. Kitchin, M.A., formerly Censor of Christ Church. Crown 8vo. *cloth*, 10*s*. 6*d*.

A Manual of Ancient History. By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History, formerly Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Demy 8vo. *cloth*, 14*s*.

A History of Germany and of the Empire, down to the close of the Middle Ages. By J. Bryce, D.C.L., Regius Professor of Civil Law, Oxford.

A History of Germany, from the Reformation. By Adolphus W. Ward, M.A., Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, Professor of History, Owens College, Manchester.

A History of British India. By S. J. Owen, M.A., Reader in History, Christ Church, and Teacher of Indian Law and History in the University of Oxford.

A History of Greece. By E. A. Freeman, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

V. LAW.

Elements of Law considered with reference to Principles of General Jurisprudence. By William Markby, M.A., Judge of the High Court of Judicature, Calcutta. Crown 8vo. *cloth*, 6*s*. 6*d*.

Gaii Institutionum Juris Civilis Commentarii Quatuor; or, Elements of Roman Law by Gaius. With a Translation and Commentary. By Edward Poste, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 8vo. *cloth*, 16*s*.

The Institutes of Justinian, edited as a Recension of the Institutes of Gaius. By Thomas Erskine Holland, B.C.L., Vinerian Reader in Law, and formerly Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 5*s*.

The Elements of Jurisprudence. By the same Editor.

Select Titles from the Digest of Justinian. By T. E. Holland, B.C.L., formerly Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and C. L. Shadwell, B.C.L., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. *In Parts.*

Part I. **Introductory Titles.** 8vo. *sewed*, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Part II. **Family Law.** 8vo. *sewed*, 1*s*.

Authorities Illustrative of the History of the English Law of Real Property. By Kenelm E. Digby, M. A., formerly Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. *In the Press.*

VI: PHYSICAL SCIENCE.

Natural Philosophy. In four volumes. By Sir W. Thomson, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy, Glasgow; and P. G. Tait, M.A., Professor of Natural Philosophy, Edinburgh; formerly Fellows of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. Vol. I. 8vo. *cloth*, 1*l*. 5*s*.

Elements of Natural Philosophy. By the same Authors. Part I. 8vo. *cloth*, 9*s*.

Descriptive Astronomy. A Handbook for the General Reader, and also for practical Observatory work. With 224 illustrations and numerous tables. By G. F. Chambers, F.R.A.S., Barrister-at-Law. Demy 8vo. 856 pp., *cloth*, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Chemistry for Students. By A. W. Williamson, Phil. Doc., F.R.S., Professor of Chemistry, University College, London. *A new Edition, with Solutions.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 8*s.* 6*d.*

A Treatise on Heat, with numerous Woodcuts and Diagrams. By Balfour Stewart, LL.D., F.R.S., Professor of Physics, Owens College, Manchester. *Second Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Forms of Animal Life. By G. Rolleston, M.D., F.R.S., Linacre Professor of Physiology, Oxford. Illustrated by Descriptions and Drawings of Dissections. Demy 8vo. *cloth*, 16*s.*

Exercises in Practical Chemistry. By A. G. Vernon Harcourt, M.A., F.R.S., Senior Student of Christ Church, and Lee's Reader in Chemistry; and H. G. Madan, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford.

Series I. Qualitative Exercises. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. *cloth*, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Series II. Quantitative Exercises.

Geology of Oxford and the Valley of the Thames. By John Phillips, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Geology, Oxford. 8vo. *cloth*, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Crystallography. By M. H. N. Story-Maskelyne, M.A., Professor of Mineralogy, Oxford; and Deputy Keeper in the Department of Minerals, British Museum.

Mineralogy. By the same Author.

Physiological Physics. By G. Griffith, M.A., Jesus College, Oxford, Assistant Secretary to the British Association, and Natural Science Master at Harrow School.

VII. ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

A First Reading Book. By Marie Eichens of Berlin; and edited by Anne J. Clough. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *stiff covers*, 4*d.*

Oxford Reading Book, Part I. For Little Children. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *stiff covers*, 6*d.*

Oxford Reading Book, Part II. For Junior Classes. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *stiff covers*, 6*d.*

On the Principles of Grammar. By E. Thring, M.A., Head Master of Uppingham School. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Grammatical Analysis, designed to serve as an Exercise and Composition Book in the English Language. By E. Thring, M.A., Head Master of Uppingham School. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s.* 6*d.*

An English Grammar and Reading Book, for Lower Forms in Classical Schools. By O. W. Tancock, M.A., Assistant Master of Sherborne School. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Specimens of Early English. A New and Revised Edition. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By R. Morris, LL.D. and W. W. Skeat, M.A.
Part I. *In the Press.*
Part II. From Robert of Gloucester to Gower (A.D. 1298 to A.D. 1393). Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Specimens of English Literature, from the 'Ploughmans Crede' to the 'Shepheardes Calender' (A.D. 1394 to A.D. 1579). With Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman, by William Langland. Edited, with Notes, by W. W. Skeat, M.A., formerly Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Chaucer. The Prioresses Tale; Sir Thopas; The Monkes Tale; The Clerkes Tale; The Squieres Tale, &c. Edited by W. W. Skeat, M.A., Editor of Piers the Plowman, &c.. &c. *Nearly ready.*

Milton. The Areopagitica. With Notes. By J. W. Hales, M.A., late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s.*

The Philology of the English Tongue. By J. Earle, M.A., formerly Fellow of Oriel College, and Professor of Anglo-Saxon, Oxford. *Second Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Typical Selections from the best English Authors from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century, (to serve as a higher Reading Book,) with Introductory Notices and Notes, being a Contribution towards a History of English Literature. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 4*s.* 6*d.*

See also XII. below for other English Classics.

VIII. FRENCH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

Brachet's Historical Grammar of the French Language. Translated by G. W. Kitchin, M.A. *Second Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s.* 6*d.*

An Etymological Dictionary of the French Language, with a Preface on the Principles of French Etymology. By A. Brachet. Translated by G. W. Kitchin, M.A. Crown 8vo. *cloth*, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Corneille's Cinna, and **Molière's** Les Femmes Savantes. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Gustave Masson. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Racine's Andromaque, and **Corneille's** Le Menteur. With Louis Racine's Life of his Father. By the same Editor. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin, and **Racine's** Athalie. With Voltaire's Life of Molière. By the same Editor. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Selections from the Correspondence of **Madame de Sévigné** and her chief Contemporaries. Intended more especially for Girls' Schools. By the same Editor. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s.*

Voyage autour de ma Chambre, by **Xavier de Maistre;** Ourika by MADAME DE DURAS; La Dot de Suzette by FIEVÉE; Les Jumeaux de l'Hôtel Corneille, by EDMOND ABOUT; Mésaventures d'un Écolier, by RODOLPHE TÖPFFER. By the same Editor. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

IX. GERMAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

Goethe's Egmont. With a Life of Goethe, &c. By C. A. Buchheim, Phil. Doc., Professor in King's College, London; sometime Examiner to the University of London. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s*.

Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. With a Life of Schiller; an historical and critical Introduction, Arguments, and a complete Commentary. By the same Editor. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s*. 6*d*.

Lessing's Minna von Barnhelm. A Comedy. With a Life of Lessing, Critical Analysis, Complete Commentary, &c. By the same Editor. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s*. 6*d*.

X. ART, &c.

A Handbook of Pictorial Art. By R. St. J. Tyrwhitt, M.A., formerly Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford. With coloured Illustrations, Photographs, and a chapter on Perspective by A. Macdonald. 8vo. *half morocco*, 18*s*.

A Treatise on Harmony. By Sir F. A. Gore Ouseley, Bart., M.A., Mus. Doc., Professor of Music in the University of Oxford. 4to. *cloth*, 10*s*.

A Treatise on Counterpoint, Canon, and Fugue, based upon that of Cherubini. By the same Author. 4to. *cloth*, 16*s*.

A Treatise on Form in Music, and General Composition. By the same Author. *Preparing*.

A Music Primer for Schools. By J. Troutbeck, M.A., and R. F. Dale, M.A., B. Mus. Crown 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s*. 6*d*.

The Cultivation of the Speaking Voice. By John Hullah. Crown 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s*. 6*d*.

XI. MISCELLANEOUS.

Dante. Selections from the Inferno. With Introduction and Notes. By H. B. Cotterill, B.A., Assistant Master in Haileybury College. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 4*s*. 6*d*. *Just Published.*

A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew. By S. R. Driver, M.A., Fellow of New College. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 6*s*. 6*d*.

Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament. By C. E. Hammond, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s*. 6*d*.

The Modern Greek Language in its relation to Ancient Greek. By E. M. Geldart, B.A., formerly Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford. Extr. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 4*s*. 6*d*.

A System of Physical Education: Theoretical and Practical. By Archibald Maclaren, The Gymnasium, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 7*s*. 6*d*.

XII. A SERIES OF ENGLISH CLASSICS.

Designed to meet the wants of Students in English Literature: under the superintendence of the Rev. J. S. BREWER, M.A., *of Queen's College, Oxford, and Professor of English Literature at King's College, London.*

THERE are two dangers to which the student of English Literature is exposed at the outset of his task;—his reading is apt to be too narrow or too diffuse.

Out of the vast number of authors set before him in books professing to deal with this subject he knows not which to select: he thinks he must read a little of all; he soon abandons so hopeless an attempt; he ends by contenting himself with second-hand information; and professing to study English Literature, he fails to master a single English author. On the other hand, by confining his attention to one or two writers, or to one special period of English Literature, the student narrows his view of it; he fails to grasp the subject as a whole; and in so doing misses one of the chief objects of his study.

How may these errors be avoided? How may minute reading be combined with comprehensiveness of view?

In the hope of furnishing an answer to these questions the Delegates of the Press, acting upon the advice and experience of Professor Brewer, have determined to issue a series of small volumes, which shall embrace, in a convenient form and at a low price, the general extent of English Literature, as represented in its masterpieces at successive epochs. It is thought that the student, by confining himself, in the first instance, to those authors who are most worthy of his attention, will be saved from the dangers of hasty and indiscriminate reading. By adopting the course thus marked out for him, he will become familiar with the productions of the greatest minds in English Literature; and should he never be able to pursue the subject

beyond the limits here prescribed, he will have laid the foundation of accurate habits of thought and judgment, which cannot fail of being serviceable to him hereafter.

The authors and works selected are such as will best serve to illustrate English Literature in its *historical* aspect. As 'the eye of history,' without which history cannot be understood, the literature of a nation is the clearest and most intelligible record of its life. Its thoughts and its emotions, its graver and its less serious modes, its progress, or its degeneracy, are told by its best authors in their best words. This view of the subject will suggest the safest rules for the study of it.

With one exception all writers before the Reformation are excluded from the Series. However great may be the value of literature before that epoch, it is not completely national. For it had no common organ of language; it addressed itself to special classes; it dealt mainly with special subjects. Again; of writers who flourished after the Reformation, who were popular in their day, and reflected the manners and sentiments of their age, the larger part by far must be excluded from our list. Common sense tells us that if young persons, who have but a limited time at their disposal, read Marlowe or Greene, Burton, Hakewill or Du Bartas, Shakespeare, Bacon, and Milton will be comparatively neglected.

Keeping, then, to the best authors in each epoch—and here popular estimation is a safe guide—the student will find the following list of writers amply sufficient for his purpose: Chaucer, Spenser, Hooker, Shakespeare, Bacon, Milton, Dryden, Bunyan, Pope, Johnson, Burke, and Cowper. In other words, Chaucer is the exponent of the Middle Ages in England; Spenser of the Reformation and the Tudors; Hooker of the latter years of Elizabeth; Shakespeare and Bacon of the transition from Tudor to Stuart; Milton of Charles I and the Commonwealth; Dryden and Bunyan of the Restoration; Pope of Anne and the House

of Hanover; Johnson, Burke, and Cowper of the reign of George III to the close of the last century.

The list could be easily enlarged; the names of Jeremy Taylor, Clarendon, Hobbes, Locke, Swift, Addison, Goldsmith, and others are omitted. But in so wide a field, the difficulty is to keep the series from becoming unwieldy, without diminishing its comprehensiveness. Hereafter, should the plan prove to be useful, some of the masterpieces of the authors just mentioned may be added to the list.

The task of selection is not yet finished. For purposes of education, it would neither be possible, nor, if possible, desirable, to place in the hands of students the whole of the works of the authors we have chosen. We must set before them only the masterpieces of literature, and their studies must be directed, not only to the greatest minds, but to their choicest productions. These are to be read again and again, separately and in combination. Their purport, form, language, bearing on the times, must be minutely studied, till the student begins to recognise the full value of each work both in itself and in its relations to those that go before and those that follow it.

It is especially hoped that this Series may prove useful to Ladies' Schools and Middle Class Schools; in which English Literature must always be a leading subject of instruction.

A General Introduction to the Series. By Professor Brewer, M.A.

1. **Chaucer.** The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales; The Knightes Tale; The Nonne Prestes Tale. Edited by R. Morris Editor for the Early English Text Society, &c., &c. *Third Edition.* Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

2. **Spenser's Faery Queene.** Books I and II. Designed chiefly for the use of Schools. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By G. W. Kitchin, M.A., formerly Censor of Christ Church.

   Book I. *Fifth Edition.* Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*
   Book II. *Second Edition.* Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

3. **Hooker.** Ecclesiastical Polity, Book I. Edited by R. W. Church, M.A., Dean of St. Paul's, formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 2*s.*

4. **Shakespeare.** Select Plays. Edited by W. G. Clark, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and W. Aldis Wright, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. Extra fcap. 8vo. *stiff covers.*

   I. The Merchant of Venice. 1*s.*
   II. Richard the Second. 1*s.* 6*d.*
   III. Macbeth. 1*s.* 6*d.*
   IV. Hamlet. 2*s.*
   V. The Tempest. By W. Aldis Wright, M.A. 1*s.* 6*d.* *Just Published.*

5. **Bacon.** Advancement of Learning. Edited by W. Aldis Wright, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 4*s.* 6*d.*

6. **Milton.** Poems. Edited by R. C. Browne, M.A., and Associate of King's College, London. 2 vols. *Second Edition.* Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 6*s.* 6*d.*

   Sold separately, Vol. I. 4*s.*, Vol. II. 3*s.*

7. **Dryden.** Stanzas on the Death of Oliver Cromwell; Astraea Redux; Annus Mirabilis; Absalom and Achitophel; Religio Laici; The Hind and the Panther. Edited by W. D. Christie, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s.* 6*d.*

8. **Bunyan.** Grace Abounding; The Pilgrim's Progress. Edited by E. Venables, M.A., Canon of Lincoln.

9. **Pope.** With Introduction and Notes. By Mark Pattison, B.D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford.

   I. Essay on Man. *Second Edition.* Extra fcap. 8vo. *stiff covers*, 1*s.* 6*d.*
   II. Satires and Epistles. Extra fcap. 8vo. *stiff covers*, 2*s.*

10. **Johnson.** Rasselas; Lives of Pope and Dryden. Edited by C. H. O. Daniel, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Worcester College, Oxford.

11. **Burke.** Thoughts on the Present Discontents; the Two Speeches on America; Reflections on the French Revolution. By E. J. Payne, B.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford. Vol. I. Extra fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 4*s.* 6*d.*

    Vol. II. *In the Press.*

12. **Cowper.** The Task, with Tirocinium, and some of the Minor Poems. Vol. II. Edited by H. T. Griffith, B.A., Pembroke College, Oxford. Ext. fcap. 8vo. *cloth*, 3*s.*

    Vol. I. *In the Press.*

Published for the University by

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

The DELEGATES OF THE PRESS *invite suggestions and advice from all persons interested in education; and will be thankful for hints, &c., addressed to either the* Rev. G. W. KITCHIN, *St. Giles's Road East, Oxford, or the* SECRETARY TO THE DELEGATES, *Clarendon Press, Oxford.*

JUN 1 1986
JUN 1 1987
JUN 1 1989
SEP 10 1996
FEB 10 1997
SEP 10 1997

3 2044 029 853 439